Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. BAP W 1[illegible]

SCB 10394

A

TREATISE

ON

BAPTISM:

BEING

A REPLY

To a Book entitled

A DEBATE ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,

BETWEEN

MR. JOHN WALKER & ALEXANDER CAMPBELL,

Held at Mountpleasant, on the 19th & 20th June, 1820.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A LETTER

TO THE

REV. SAMUEL RALSTON.

BY JOHN WALKER,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL IN THE ASSOCIATE CONGREGATIONS OF MOUNTPLEASANT AND UNITY, OHIO.

Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth. Prov. 27. 2.

The last shall be first, & the first last. Matt. 20. 16.

A double minded man is unstable in all his ways. James, 1. 8.

MOUNTPLEASANT, OHIO.

B. WRIGHT & B. BATES—PRINTERS.

1824.

DISTRICT OF OHIO, Sct.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the nineteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord, one thousand, eight hundred and twenty three, and in the forty eighth year of the American Independence, JOHN WALKER of said District, hath deposited in this Office, the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as author, in the words and figures following, to wit: "A Treatise on Baptism, being a reply to a book entitled a debate on Christian Baptism, between MR. JOHN WALKER and ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, held at Mt. Pleasant on the 19th and 20th June, 1820, to which is added, a Letter to the Rev. SAMUEL RALSTON, by JOHN WALKER, Minister of the Gospel, in the associate congregations of Mt. Pleasant and Unity, Ohio." In conformity to the act of Congress of the United States, entitled "an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned," and also of the act entitled, "an act supplementary to an act entitled, an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching, historical and other prints."

L. S.

HARVEY D. EVANS.

Clerk of the District of Ohio.

PROPERTY OF
INCETO

PREFACE.

At the time of the public dispute, I intimated that I had no design of writing upon the subject of baptism. Mr. Campbell often intimated his intention of writing. I then believed as I spoke; and had Mr. C. given my arguments as they were delivered, or even hav done me *tolerable* Justice; I should never have written.

His book however was harmless in the neighbourhood of the place where the dispute was; there people had heard the dispute & judged for themselves. Still I had no intention of publishing. But some considerable time after, I received letters from distant places, where people had no knowledge, either of Mr. C. or myself, earnestly requesting me to publish. I at length complied, and commenced making some preparations. Sometime after this, I understood, that a second edition of Mr. C's. book was about to be published in Pittsburg. I waited anxiously, but yet waited a long time, hoping that Mr. C. would make such alterations, or concessions, as would either supercede the necessity of my publication, or make me think that he designed to be candid and tell the truth. But I was astonished when the second edition made its appearance. —It was Mr. C. still.

A multiplicity of official concerns and providential occurrences delayed this work, otherwise it might have appeared much sooner.

The defence of truth was, the end I proposed by the public debate, it was the end I had in view when I wrote. How far it is gained the reader may judge.

I might mention that I understand Mr. C. is publishing a history of the dipute between Mr. M'Cala and himself; on the subject on which we disputed, I hope the public is apprized of the credit due to the statements in Mr C's. book, where *himself* is concerned.

The church of Christ feels the effect of devision, when the truth is told; sufficient are our defects; but any person who by known misrepresentation, will add to her grievances should not have his name enrolled among her members.

I only ask the reader to pass over all my defects in construction, or language, and receive my sentiments only so far as they are the mind of Christ.

New Athens, January, 14th. 1824.

INTRODUCTION.

Sometime early in the year 1820, Mr. Walker was requested to preach on the subject of baptism, at the house of a Mr. John Gray; about five miles S. W. from Mountpleasant, Ohio, in the vicinity of a Baptist meeting house. The Baptists about that time, were making a considerable stir in the neighbourhood, and such preachers as they had, were zealously opposing the doctrine of infant baptism, and the mode of sprinkling, in the administration of this sacrament. Mr. W. answered the request, and preached upon the subject. He felt conscious of the unpopularity of preaching on any disputed subject; but believed it to be his duty, rather to consult the interests of truth, than popular opinion. Accordingly, he preached on that passage, Math. 3. 11. *I indeed Baptize you with water.* In answering objectrons offered by Baptists, Mr. W. found it necessary to reply to some observations made by a Dr. Baldwin; because the Baptists were industriously circulating these pamphlets, in the neighbourhood at that time. When the sermon was closed, and the public work of the day finished, a Mr. Birch, said to be a Baptist preacher, requested Mr. W. to point out the part quoted in any of the works of Dr. Baldwin. Mr. W. had the pamphlet in his pocket, and the different passages marked, to which he refered, in the sermon. He immediately showed Mr. B. the passage. After some observations upon it, Mr. W. observed, that he understood there were two Baptist preachers present; that men professing this character, should be unwilling to mislead people; and that he thought it

was now their duty to enter into a public conversation upon the subject: this would do justice to all parties, and would give the people an opportunity of judging for themselves. Mr. B. replied that he had to preach at some distance from that place, on that evening; and could not detain. Mr. W. observed that if it was not convenient for him then to detain, he thought it a duty they owed to their respective hearers and the church, again to meet, and converse upon the subject publicly. Mr. B. without agreeing, intimated to the people the day on which he would preach on the subject, and so closed the conversation.

Sometime after this, Mr. W. received a line from the same Mr. B. informing him, that he should be met on the subject of the sermon, by some Baptist minister. To which Mr. W. expressed his readiness to comply, upon two conditions. 1st. That he should be of good moral character: and 2ndly. That he should be a regular minister of the baptist society. Mr. B. in reply, wrote that he had obtained a consent from Mr. Alexander Campbell, a regular minister of their church, and intimated that he should meet Mr. W. for a public dispute on the 19th of June, at Mountpleasant. This is the whole foundation of the *pompous* and *bantering* advertisement of which Mr. C. declared himself the author.

Mr. W. neither challenged Mr. Campbell, or any other minister of the baptist church, for a public dispute. He requested a public conversation, with any who heard him preach the sermon on that subject, but did no more.

On the morning of the public dispute, Mr. W. requested some proof of Mr. C's being a regular Baptist minister. Mr. Birch read some of the ex-

tracts of the minutes of their associations; these mentioned that Mr. C. was a writing clerk at some of their meetings; but whether he took any part in their deliberations, or decisions, was not stated: or whether he was a hired, voluntary, or stated clerk, no hint was given. Mr. W. as he had no disposition to decline the debate, however admitted that he was some species of Baptist minister; although he felt persuaded that the state of the Baptist church was low, when Mr. C. was chosen for their BEST.*

The following rules were presented by the Judges, Mr. Martin and Rev. Findly, and signed by the disputants.

---

*It is disputed by some baptists, whether Mr. C. was ever admitted as a regular minister of their church; yet I think it probable he was, because I understand some left their communion in consequence of his admission. However, let this matter be as it may, some years ago, no baptist association, would have admitted him; for whatever were the conditions of his admission, it is now completely in his power to disseminate all his particular views amongst the members of that society—his opinion of the moral law—covenant of works, and particularly of the sabbath, will, in due time, take root among them. And, as there are but few learned ministers in that church, in the western country, it will give him influence. Whatever may be the opinion of his learned acquaintances, he considers himself no mean scholar. Influence, without soundness, is dangerous. It would be well for the Baptist association to read Paul's 1st. Epistle to the Corinthians.

'This controversy shall be conducted by the following regulations, viz.

'1st. It shall be opened with prayer, by some person agreed upon by the parties.

'2nd. The parties shall not be permitted to interrupt each other, except to correct mistakes.

'3rd. All diminutive, or disrespectful personal allusions, and all impassioned declamation, shall be deemed disorderly.

'4th. In all cases, the privileges, and regulations of each party shall be equal.

'5th. The points to be adhered to in the discussion, are first, the subjects, and secondly, the mode of christian baptism, viz. Are believing adults *alone* to be baptized, or are their infant offspring to be included with them, in their right to that ordinance? and is immersion as the mode, exclusively to be used?

'6th. Each of the parties may, at their option, occupy forty minutes in their stated replies, but shall not be obliged to fill up that length of time; nor on the account of stopping, even at the expiration of 3 or 5 minutes, be considered as yielding the question."

'7th. This controversy will be the subject of adjournment, from day to day, until the subjects are discussed, to the satisfaction of the judges."*

---

* These rules being the constitution by which the disputants were governed, must have been more radically fixed in the memory of Mr. C. than any of Mr. W's speeches. The reader will do well to compare these rules with those mentioned by Mr. C. in his preface; and if, in the *rules* of the debate, such were his deviations, what is to be ex-

Before signing the above, Mr. C. contended a long time upon the impropriety of first discussing the *subjects* of infant Baptism, telling the audience that the *mode* was the most important subject, and should be first discussed; that "sprinkling was no more baptism, than a thong of leather was his boot." The parties agreed to choose twelve men, to decide upon the question, that should be first discussed; these were to choose the thirteenth. These men returned, in a few minutes, and reported that the *proper subjects* of baptism was to be the first, and most appropriate question, to be discussed.†

Mr. Walker then proceeded to read the advertisement mentioned above, in which it was stated that "Mr. Walker having challenged any minister of the baptist church" &c. Mr. Walker then publicly denied, that ever he had challenged any minister of the Baptist church, for a dispute. Mr. C. after stating that he was the author of the publication, said that he had received the information from Mr. Birch: by request, Mr. B. then made a full statement of what had passed at the place, at

---

pected in the view he has given us of the speeches?

These rules were obtained from Mr. Findly, by Mr. Munroe of Canonsburg, Washington Co. Pa.

† The persons chosen by Mr. C. were Esq. Curtis, Messrs. Martin, Birch, Dawsey, Thomas Campbell, and Bryant.

By Mr. W. Rev. Findly, Anderson, Dr. Hamilton, Messrs. Adams, P. Miller & McLaughlin. The 13th chosen by them was Mr. McMillen.

which Mr. W. preached.‖ The substance of which is already given. Mr. Birch gave no hint of such a challenge. A falsehood rested some place; and, although Mr. W. proved to the satisfaction of the public, that no such challenge was given, Mr. C. never blushed—he appeared at ease; this however, was tolerable. The size of the audience, and Mr. C's opinion of himself, now required him to put the best possible face upon the matter: but extraordinary as it may appear, we have the same assertion in his printed history of the dispute, Page 1. The conversation Mr. W. had with Mr. B. was public. The public statement made by Mr. B. was accurate—Mr. C. is left alone in the assertion.

The import of the advertisement was, that, as Mr. W. Goliah-like has defied the whole forces of the Baptist church—I Alexander Campbell, a regular minister of the Baptist church. still mightier than he, in the name of the whole Baptist society, am determined to meet him. ‡

Mr. C. long anxious to make a publick appearance, endeavouring by every possible exertion to have himself noticed, having failed with the best classes of religious society, appears under the signature of "*Candidus*" (a term the least appropriate to himself) in which he openly enlists against moral societies—against the religious observation of the

‖ The fright in which Mr. B. appeared, I think did not prevent him from telling the truth, I believe he was candid.

‡ Mr. C. styles himself a *regular minister* of the Baptist Church, in the title page of his book—has this church two orders of the ministry, one regular—another irregular?

sabbath, &c.—securing to himself a retreat, when the assylum of regular churches became hopeless. But now an excellent opportunity offers in public debate; he embraces it; and, when the world refuses approbation, he easily supplies the defect, by giving it to himself.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

That there was a public dispute between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Walker, on the 19th and 20th of June, 1820, is almost the only truth contained in a publication, written by Mr. Campbell; purporting tobe a history of that dispute, & stating the substance of the speeches delivered by the disputants.

If it had been the intention of Mr. C. to do justice, he would have only published such notes as were taken by disinterested persons; the disputants themselves had another employment than taking notes—those observations were alone noted by them to which they intended to eply.¶ Mr. T. Campbell, Father of Mr. A. Campbell, with whose notes Mr. C. says he was favored—page 2nd, actively commenced taking notes at the beginning of the dispute; but after the second reply made by Mr. W. he ceased, in a great measure, noting; and wrote tickets and handed them across the table to his son. This conduct, certainly unjust, was mentioned to Mr. W. in the first recess: but he felt no disposition to forbid it. Mr. Findly, one of the judges, also mentioned this circumstance, but said he would not cause him to desist, unless I required him; lest they should think he was assuming. The truth is, the son needed the assistance of the Father, without whose help, the debate would not

¶ A short publication in the Washington Reporter, signed *Pluto*, was the first truth published respecting this debate—I am not certain who was the author of that paper—he has certainly done justice to the disputants, though his signature would have permitted him to have taken all the liberty of Mr. Campbell.

probably have lasted through the first day. Mr. W. contended with the father & the son for two days. Had this in any degree aided the investigation of truth, it might have been borne with. But it was generally observed, that when the son received a note from the father he, always made an effort to change his ground; because the old gentleman thought it not tenable. The truth is, the son only excells the father, in ease of communication; but in disputation, the father as far excells the son—and, although the father is deservedly unnoticed by the living, it is not because he is deficient, either in literature or talents; but because, from some species of delirium, his faith, his creed was as changeable in character and positions, as the *aurora borealis*.

On the 19 and 20 of June Mr. C. had not the power of forming his opponent; but when he comes to write, he makes one small enough—one easily vanquished. This is first manifest in the length of his peeches compared with those of Mr. W. The following certificate I received from a learned gentlemen, member of the general assembly church, who attended every moment of the debate.

"Debate on baptism by J walker and A Campbell; length of time spoken by each. Each spoke 16 times in the following proportions.

"Question 1st. Who were the fit subjects of Baptism?

Mr. Walker.		Mr. Campbell.	
Speech.	*minutes.*	*Speech.*	*minutes.*
1	3	2	19
3	13	4	1
5	29	6	21
7	22	8	32
9	20	10	26

11 -	25	12 -	27
13 -	15	14 -	28
15 -	25	16 -	40
17 -	26	18 -	10
19 -	37	20 -	32
21 -	14	22 -	27
23 -	29	24 -	24
25 -	27	26 -	31.
27 -	29	28 -	40

Q. 2nd. What is the proper mode of Baptism?

Mr. Walker.		Mr. Campbell.	
Speech.	*minutes.*	*Speech.*	*minutes.*
1	14	2	39
3	20	4	35

Total length of Mr. C's speeches, 7 hours 12 minutes.

Total length of Mr. W's speeches, 5 hours 48 minutes.

Difference in favor of Mr. C. during the 2 days, 1 hour 24 minutes.

I certify the above to be correct.

JOHN M'CRACKEN.

But the form in which we find the speeches of Mr. W. in the miserable statement of his arguments, may indeed render them an easy prey to Mr. C. Some of the most important observations are entirely omitted. He appears only to have introduced as many of Mr. W's arguments as served his purpose; & even these are presented in such a mutilated form, that he (Mr. C.) might the more easily manage them. Thus Mr. C. makes a collection of arguments in a pitiful shape indeed; then displays his eloquence in causing them to expire. Had Mr. C. by writing, only intended to reply to those arguments used by Mr. W. in the de-

bate, which he found himself unable, at that time to answer, there might have been some excuse; but, when the whole history of the debate is his declared object; the world can never approbate his honesty.

Out of many examples I shall only note a few; and let these serve for the remainder—page 51. He represents Mr. W. as asking for "a positive command for the institution of a church." To this Mr. C. replies with great activity, page 52. The question was never asked, nor had it any meaning; and of course the reply was lost. The question was. "Have we a positive command, for all the acknowledged institutions of the church?" Had he stated the question, as it was, we might have expected some form of an answer. We might then have tried him upon some of those rites in the church he acknowledges.

To save himself the odium which every man of sense must of necessity attach to him, we have him setting his phrases of astonishment differently, in his book, from the facts, as they were delivered in the debate. When speaking of the new covenant, pag. 39, 'Paul saith the new covenant 'is better than the old. Mr. W. says it is just the same.' He then adds that *burst* of acclamation page 86, 'I stand on the first ground on which I 'have ever heard &c.' But this he has omitted; for then it would have been evident that he never had read any theological work, and that he never had been a pedo-Baptist.

Pag. 65. He has Mr. W. asserting that the church received its origin with Abraham's covenant. But Mr. W. had no disposition to date the commencement of the existence of a church, with Abraham; but throughout the whole debate he maintained that the church commenced its exis-

tence with the first person on earth that believed; yet asserted that the church received a particular organization in Abraham.

Pag. 81. Mr. W. asks, what did circumcision seal 'to Ishmael?' This question was important—Mr. C. to have given it an honest answer, would have lost a *point*: but after he diverts the reader with a few *flourishes* upon it, he takes an easy way of removing the difficulty, P. 90, 'Mr. Walker will 'please to answer the following queries. 1st. What did circumcision seal to Ishmael?

P. 75. In a part of Mr. W's. speech, we have this expression—"I maintain that temporal blessings as well as spiritual are enjoyed through 'Christ, or were a part of Christ's purchase". Upon this he adds a few jests, and intimates a fact, which otherwise might never have been learned, that he hadheard of the Covenanters & Seceders in Scotland, P. 78. But the truth is, Mr. W. never made the assertion; or even Mr. C. these remarks, until they were made in his book. For the satisfaction of the reader, I shall copy the notes of Mr. Miller as they were taken. 'As all 'the blessings believers enjoy, come through the 'covenant of grace, and as circumcision was a 'seal of that covenant, circumcision confirmed the 'promise of temporal blessings, as well as spiritu-'al; but, as it was a seal of the covenant of grace, 'denied that it confirmed the promise of temporal 'blessings only.' Throughout the debate, Mr. W. expressed no other sentiment than that common to pedo—Baptists; much less did he oppose a sentiment of that branch of the church, to which he has the honor of belonging. Mr. C. whose christian system (if it may be so called,) has become so general, seems incapable of comprehend-

ing, that right which the covenant of grace conveys to believers, in their enjoyments of temporal blessings; and of understanding why the earthly Canaan was promised to Abraham and to his seed by Isaac.

Mr. W. showed that the right which Abraham had to that land, was materially the same with that which any believer had to his earthly possessions. A blessing through Christ, removes the curse from temporal things. And this is universally true, to all saints; whether they lived under the old or new testament. Thus, by misrepresentation, which I hope was not wilful, and then by some sporting upon it, a share of the arguments of the debate was lost.

I might notice such things in almost every page, but why complain? the sacred oracles have received the same treatment; some of these will be noticed in due time. I would now call the attention of the reader to one, Pag. 164—Mr. C. says Christ was born to *perform 'the mercy promised* BY 'THE FATHER, *and to remember his holy covenant.'* Luke 1 72, *'To perform the mercy promised* TO OUR 'FATHERS *and to remember his holy covenant.'* If Mr. C. had done this passage justice, even in quotation, it would have told the reader a fact, that the covenant of grace had an entailment—that promises were made by God to children through their parents; a truth which every Baptist feels unwilling to grant.

In Page. 196, he makes the following statement 'I would observe, that at the close of the 'debate at Mountpleasant, some of the Pedo-Bap-'tists (as I afterwards understood from some of 'the most creditable witnesses) proposed violently 'forcing us to quit the ground by *argumentum Ba-*

'*culinum*.' The truth of this matter is known to Mr. C. He should not have made this statement. I will now narrate the substance of the whole matter. Mr. Thos. Campbell, Father of Mr. A. C. when the work was over, rose and addressed the audience; as he had no legal concern in the matter, and was guilty of improperly aiding his son, in the dispute, and for many years had been extremely unpopular—a few of Mr. C's own country men cryed out—'DOWN THE OLD APOSTATE,' 'DOWN THE OLD APOSTATE.' When the old gentleman began to speak, Mr. W. mentioned to Mr. C. to request his father to desist; lest the resentment of the public would be expressed too far—Mr. T. C. had no more right to speak than any other man in that assembly. He declared in that speech, that he had "retired behind the curtain" and it was generally believed that he would do the most good by staying there.

But as it respects Mr. A. Campbell, a leading pedo-baptist had spoken to a respectable inkeeper in the town of Mountpleasant; to treat him well and keep him free of expense; all of which was done, Mr. W. feels persuaded that there were no affronts offered to Mr. A. Campbell during that debate, that he received honorable treatment, throughout that occasion, by all classes of the audience. These complaints, however, serve to characterise Mr. C.—and show what those are to expect who treat him well.

The observations of Mr. C. upon the Rev. Findly are both unjust and ungenerous Although Mr. W. is in a great measure unacquainted with Mr. Findly, yet his conduct as a judge in that de-

bate was upright.* Mr. Findly objected to the reading of Robison's observations upon the character of Cyprian, noticed by Mr. C. in page 118 —because at that time, it was an unnecessary ruin of the character of a good man. Had any author of good standing been brought forward to impeach the character of Cyprian, as it respected truth and veracity; it would have been relevant; and Mr. Findly would not have objected—Because the only use Mr. W. had made of the works of Cyprian, was to enquire after the truth of a single fact, whether infants were baptised or not, in that age. But to expose what Mr. Robison supposed were his errors, did not effect his veracity as an historian.

The address of Mr. Findly as one of the judges was only a discharge of the duty of his station, during the debate. The judge of Mr. C. had the same opportunity, if he thought his cause would not justify him in using his privilege. Mr. F. was not to blame: and because he told his sentiments without disguise, Mr. C. should not have been offended. For the satisfaction of the reader I shall now publish the substance of the speech of Mr. Findly as handed me by one who noted the substance of what he spoke.

"Mr. Findly remarked as follows." 'To my 'satisfaction, my brethren, Mr. Walker has

* Mr. Findly was chosen by Mr. W. as his Judge, not from any previous acquaintance, but for two reasons. 1st. Because he was not a minister of the same communion and therefore impartial, and 2nd. Because he had publicly defended the moral association of West Middleton against the attacks of Mr. Campbell.

'proven that the church received its first public 'organization in Abraham, by that covenant called 'the covenant of circumcision—and that in this 'covenant was revealed the covenant of grace, 'which presented to men the everlasting gospel, 'and organized them into a visible body called '*the church;* and it has been proven to my satisfac- 'tion, that circumcision was, at that time, the only 'visible sign of that organized body, *the church;* 'and so long as the body will remain visible, it will 'have visible signs necessarily connected with the 'administration of the covenant of grace."

'It is certainly admitted that the church thus 'defined, exists in the present day. The chang- 'ing of the outward sign, no more destroys the 'church, than the changing of a man's name, 'changes his being. In this visible organization of 'the covenant of grace, children were introduced 'by positive Divine authority. It is admitted that 'the sign is changed, but the members are not ex- 'pelled.'

'There is still a sign; this is baptism; children 'were formerly acknowledged members of the vis- 'ible church, as divinely constituted. When? 'where? or by whom is this abrogated?"

"It is acknowledged that members of the 'church are entitled to baptism; but the member- 'ship of children is proved; *suffer little children to 'come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* 'God has, in every age of the church, acknow- 'ledged the children of his people as near to him. 'So the apostle argues Rom. 11. and 1st. Cor. 7. 'And the continued history of the church confirms 'and illustrates the scriptures on this point."

"Brethren; it is now evident, on the side of the 'opposition, that their principles not only tend to

'the denial, but in fact do deny the being, of a 'church before the coming of Christ—and since 'that time, their principles do actually un'church 'the whole christian world, with the exception 'of that small section of the church called Baptists.'

'Permit me also to observe that on the side of 'the opposition, the question in debate was seldom 'touched; the speaker wandered from the point, 'flew from the subject, and with *gigantic strides*, 'entered into an uncultivated field of witticisms; 'and thereby attempted to direct the attention of 'the audience from the subject in dispute, or di-'vert by touches of oratory, or rather *gilded* & '*painted* buffoonery, and satyrizim, not only his 'opponent and the cause which he ably and judi-'ciously defended; but also those precious men of 'God who being dead yet speak. He has also 'awfully abused the sacred oracles of the living 'God, by profanely jesting, and by turning, or en-'deavoring to turn the sacred text from its real 'import. This, my brethren, is my judgment of 'the debate. The other judge is at equal liberty 'with me to speak his mind."*

Mr. C. states that he received a letter from Mt. Pleasant, dated June 16, 1820. Signed *Philo Justitiæ*—which letter he gives to the public at length, page 4, 5. Not one word of this letter is true. All those who attended the public ministrations of Mr. W. can attest its falsity. Neither the public *banter* of Mr. C. or the dread of his *mightiness* on the mind of Mr. W. made any change in the public discourses either previous to, or since the debate.

From an intimate acquaintance with the leading

* Mr. Martin, the other judge, did not think proper to give his sentiments.

characters of that place, Mr. W. knows of none who have any acquaintance with the Latin or Greek languages, except one, who, whoever, is a gentleman; and of course was not the author of that letter, and if any other citizen unacquainted with these languages, used the signature of *Philo Justitiæ*, he was not in possession of common sense; and therefore was not entitled to credit. But the probability is, few saw this letter except Mr. C. who was well accustomed to a signature * of like import—and as unfairly applied. Why did Mr. C. give for a truth, the malicious surmise of an individual? Is the object of Mr. C. the investigation of truth?

We have an instance of, Mr. C's ingenuity, greatness of soul, and unexpected candor; which more than compensates for all his misrepresentations. As an opponent at last he appears, generous. He writes a letter to Mr. W. gives him an opportunity of correcting his book now finishing in the office at Steubenville, and with a generostiy unequaled, at his own expense, and to the great injury of his purse, dedicates *twenty four* pages of that work to the *only use of* Mr. W. in order that Mr. W. might correct mistakes if any should unfortunately be made. He had three full weeks given him for this purpose—The reader will please to read Mr. Miller's certificate.

Steubenville, May 3rd. 1823.

I do hereby inform all who may feel themselves interested in the information, that to my knowledge Mr. Walker, did not receive the letter addressed to my care for him by Mr. Campbell, until the time specified in the letter had elapsed, say a week or two at least. JAMES P. MILLER.

* Candidus.

The probability is, that Mr. C. did not suffer the letter to depart from himself until the three weeks were nearly closed - lest, unhappily, Mr. W. *might* attend to his request. Mr. C. knew that Mr. W. lived in a post-town; as a few weeks before the debate he had directed a letter to him. At any rate, Mr. W. was not a private character; and it must have been a fact, that Mr. C. knew that if he would directly send a letter to Mr. W. he would be as likely to receive it as any other person.

Why did not Mr. C. know that Mr. W. had received that letter before he printed it? As an evidence of his honesty, had he taken the trouble of asking Mr. Miller, he would have found the truth. No—Mr. C. must *appear* honest, let the truth be as it will. But had Mr. W. received the letter, what could he have done? either put one black stroke upon the whole, or have written remarks and *left* them in the power of Mr. C. to be managed as his speeches were—so that when Mr. C. was done with the remarks they would not have been Mr. W's but Mr. C's remarks.

It is not our intention, in the prosecution of the subject before us, to follow the devious track marked out by Mr. C. This would leave the subject in that form, in which none could be edified. But in the establishment of our assertions, we shall attend to all the observations of Mr. C. worthy of notice. Our first assertion is:

That God did immediately, after the fall of man, establish a church upon earth, which, has continued ever since—and will remain an everlasting kingdom.

That there is a difference between the church visible and invisible will appear by observing, 1st. That she has a visible existence, under visible laws, rules and regulations. There may be membership in this visible body, without any union in reality to Christ: although such profession will neither be profitable to the person in in time, or eternity. This appears from Math. 15. 13. "Every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted shall be rooted up." These are plants inserted by men in God's vineyard—such were Simon Magus, Demas &c. If they had not been planted they could not have been rooted up.

I would therefore define the church visible to be, a number of the family of Adam, seperated from the world by profession, and united together as a body, in professed relation to Christ their acknowledged HEAD, promising obedience to his laws, and declaring that they will receive eternal salvation from him.

But by the church invisible, we mean such members of this visible body as are united to

Christ Jesus,* living amongst the members of the visible church, and with them professing. This body I define to be a number of sinners called out of the world by the special grace of God, to eternal communion and fellowship with him—and this effected by the agency of the holy spirit, sent by Jesus Christ the Lord.

The scripture represents the church, of Christ, as composed of the different classes I have specified. Math. 13. 27. "Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? from whence then has it tares?" The distinction is also warrantable from 1st. John 2. 19. 'They went out from us, but they were not of us.' From which it is evident that they stood in *some* relation—it was not carnal, for no such relation exists in the church; it must then have been in some sense, spiritual. But they were not in fact spiritually united; because 'they were not of us.' It is evident that all the union such professors had to the church, was a professed visible relation.—They had nothing

---

*Why some distinguish the old and New Testament church, by calling the latter the *Gospel church* I cannot well understand. The dispensation of grace under the old testament, was the gospel, although it was in the form of law. They were therefore as truly members of a gospel church, as we are. To describe the New-testament church by the appellation of *gospel church*, seems rather to deny that the former dispensation was the gospel.

more, they were not united to Christ. 'They went out from us.'*

Several things were necessary to constitute a church of Christ.

1st. They must be a body seperated from the world. The Greek word *eklesia*, usually translated church, very well expresses this—called out of the world by the ordinances appointed by God for that purpose.

2nd. That the body, thus called, be considered as purchased by Christ; seeing they, with the rest of the world, were enslaved by sin, they must be a body redeemed—they must possess a plea of Justification, such as the Judge will admit. This is the righteousness of Christ. Hence the song of the true members of this body—Rev. 5. 9. Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.'

3rd. That they be recognised by Christ, as his people, to whom he gives promises, and all the ordinances of his house.

4th. That he stands related to them by a marriage covenant, in which they are his Spouse and he their husband.

That such was the church under the old testament, will appear from a few considerations.

1st. They were distinguished from the world by God himself—Amos 3. 4. 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth.' Here was a relation acknowledged to the Jews, distinct from all others. Considered abstractly as a na-

*It would not have been necessary to be so explicit in the above distinction had it not been materially denied by Mr. C.

tion, the relation of all nations, to God is the same. It is true, that under a theocratical government, they possessed more privileges than other nations; but the difference of privilege will not vary the nature of relation—Considered as a nation, they were governed by a positive law from Heaven, specially and particularly revealed,—called the *Judicial law*—but, to a certain degree, he knows all other nations in the same sense. The law of nature is also the divine privilege of nations, although Heathen—and, to all the extent that this law goes, has all the natural authority of any law. But the passage cited, expresses a distinct relation, which can only be understood of the church.

2nd. They were a people purchased. Jacob acknowledged this, Gen. 48. 16. He speaks in the true language of a member of the old-testament church. 'The angel who redeemed me from all evil.' The redemption of the church was acknowledged from the beginning. Isaiah 63. 9.' In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he *redeemed* them, and he bare them and carried them all the days of *old*.' But if any should suppose that this was a prophetic description of the New-testament church, let them attend to the words cited—that which he will do, he has done in 'the days *of old*.'

3rd. That they were organized his people, is evident from their being frequently called in scripture, by God himself, 'my people.' 'The congregation of the Lord.' &c. Nay, their unity as a body is directly expressed, Song 6. 9. 'My dove, my undefiled, is but one.'

4th. That he stood related to them, by a mar-

riage covenant, is expressly declared, Isaiah 54. 5. 'for thy maker is thine husband; the Lord of Hosts is his name.' Jer. 3. 14. 'Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord: for I am married unto you.'

But against this doctrine Mr. C. zealously contends. He is probably the first Baptist writer, that so fully asserts his opinion in opposition to it. Mr. C. not terrified at any assertion, throws off all disguise, and lets himself appear. However evident the truth of the New and Old testament church being one, is; yet the confirmation of a favorite point demands its sacrifice—it must be offered, an object is to be gained. Mr. C. must be well aware that it never entered the minds of the original Baptists to pass this *sweeping revolution*, by cutting off all the Old-testament saints, by one *blow* from church membership.

P. 26. 'This remnant according to the election 'of grace' *did not continue in the same visible state* in 'which they formerly existed. This remnant was 'the root or beginning of the new testament 'church. This remnant had no priest, no pro-'phet, no king, no temple, no sacrifice, but the crucified Jesus' &c. It is therefore evident that a difference of privileges must make a difference in the identity of a body. A man cannot be the same now he was ten years ago; for this unanswerable reason; he was then poor and he is now rich. So the church has had her times of poverty and persecution; her wealth and prosperity: she cannot therefore be the same now, she was in former times.

There was a time when she needed her temple, altars, priests &c.—but the arrival of her Lord has made her independent of these. Is she therefore

not the same body? But will Mr. C. argue, that the difference of circumstances will destroy the identity of the church? He will then destroy even identity itself—scarcely any individual body is one hour in the same precise state.

But the church has now her crucified Jesus—So had Abraham the father of the faithful "he saw his day afar off & was glad." Christ was seen by all in the same way—viz. by faith. But when Christ *did* appear in the flesh it was to 'confirm the promises made unto the fathers:" that is, to the old-testament church, Rom. 15, 8. These promises were the ground of their faith. He was their hope, their righteousness. Jer. 23, 6.

Christ was the person revealed in the first promise made to man. He is as truly the substance of the Old as of the New testament. "All things must be fulfiled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Luke 24. 44. The difference between the faith of Old and New testament saints, could never affect the justification of either; both possessed the same legal plea, and the same way of claiming it—and each had the same free grant of eternal life in the everlasting gospel. Christ came to increase both the privileges and numbers of the New testament church; but not to destroy the former and create the latter.

But his last reason, is fatal; it decides the point; none must controvert it. Page 26. 'To this society of Jews, this remnant, according to the election of grace, the Lord added the saved daily" "This was called the first christian church Acts 2. 47. But the honest reader will turn to the scripture passage quoted by Mr. C. and he will find the argument has this disadvantage, that its proof is

not in the Bible; and its highest authority is Mr. C's brain. Read the passage—"and the Lord added to the church daily, such as should be saved." But where have we any account that this "was called the first christian church?" a writer that can make scripture is never at a loss for proof. But Mr. C. unhappily connects a declaration of the apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, with this expression of Luke, in the book of Acts, because Paul, when he speaks of this remnant according to the election of grace, includes all the Jews 'saved daily' Act. 2. 47—of course, (common sense says) there could be no addition to the remnant.

This argument is therefore defective in two respects—1st. a part of it is self created—because they are not called the first christian church—2ndly. Because those converted by the ministry of Peter were not added to the remnant saved according to the election of grace, being a part of their number—Let us inquire for the simple fact! It is: those converted by the ministry of the apostles, were added to the church, which anounces to us this truth, that before this time the church of Christ existed; these converts were not the 'first christian church'—but an addition to the church. I believe that Abel, Enoch, Paul and Peter, were equally members of the 'first christian church;' against which assertion, we have not a single hint given in all Divine revelation.

'Query—was it the Jewish nation, or 'the first 'church of Christ converted in Jerusalem, to 'which the Lord added such as should be saved?' Page 42. Mr. C. grants, very properly, that it could not be the nation; and must therefore be the first Christian church. This was in the first place, useless; because that every one who can read the

scriptures, knows, that the first New testament believers were Jews, of course could not be added to the nation. That they were added to the first Christian church, is true, if by the first Christian church is meant that *precise* church, to which, Abraham, Moses and Paul belonged—and that there is another *first* or *second* church, is the thing to be proved.

The Jews, like other nations where the gospel is, had a twofold relation to God; as a nation and as a church—but these relations were as distinct in their nature, then, as they are now. As a nation, they had privileges, which nations under the New testament have not. God was their only lawgiver, and governed them by positive laws, revealed for that special purpose—and chose their kings by particular appointment: hence their government was theocratical. They were also privileged with being a nation, professing the true religion; which profession they were bound to make, by positive law. They were a nation of professors.

But distinct from this, they were the church of Christ. And although these relations were distinct, they met in the same person. A simple statement of the truth will enable Mr. C. to understand it, at least almost any other person may. As the members of a nation, even baptists will elect officers, take civil offices, collect debts, make contracts, &c. The same persons as members of the church, will go to sermon, take the sacrament, engage in religious duty, &c. To understand this, you will comprehend our assertion, that the Jews were both a nation and a church. A nation receives addition, by births, longevity &c. A church receives addition by conversions, accessions &c. Seth, Abraham, and Timothy, were members of

the same church, although of distinct nations. In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek. The privileges of the Old testament saints, prove their character as a church. They all professed to receive eternal life, by sacrifice. This they declared by the continual sacrifices they offered: which could not have any meaning, but a typical representation of the blood of Jesus. The particular efficacy which that sacrifice now has, was taught them both by the flesh they eat, & the blood that was sprinkled upon them. Compare Exod. 24, with Heb. 3. From which it is evident that blood legally offered in any age of the world was typically the redemption of the person offering.

This blood was either typically or really offered —the church before the coming of Christ, did the former, and Christ himself the latter. The Jews acknowledged by this, that in all ages of the world saints met in Christ Jesus, and had communion in his blood. This doctrine is materially conceded by Mr. C. He grants that David, Samuel, Isaac &c. were saints. Page 44. But when a number of these *saints*, under the Old testament collected for religious purposes, had dedicated themselves to God, and pledged themselves individually and as a body united, to walk 'in the law of the Lord, and keep his commandments,' why will Mr. C. refuse to have them called by the name *ekklesia*?—a church called out of the world. But in every age of the world, such a collection was found united to God and to one another—therefore in every age of the world there has been a chruch.

It is conceded that this body, under the present dispensation, possesses more privileges than in former periods; yet the idenity of the body, is the

same. A saint may have more enjoyment to day than he had yesterday, but he remains the same person. If the doctrine of Mr. C. be true, the church, in the time of the heathen, persecutions, was a distinct body from that church in the reign of Constantine; nay we have had, upon the same principle, more than a thousand distinct churches since the commencement of the New-testament dispensation. She has had at least so many changes in her history.

Mr. C. objects to an argument Mr. W. had given on Rom. 11. 17. 18. 'And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the Olive-tree, boast not against the branches.' He declares the comment of Mr. W. to be contrary to the scope of the passage, and the intention of the writer—'which was to show that God had not cast away, 'and finally rejected his Jewish people* although 'a great majority of them was cast away.' P. 26.

I reply, that when any writer, intends to establish a leading principle, he mostly travels to that end by a series of arguments. But it does no injustice to the writer, to reason, either from the position he intended to prove or any intermediate argument; because, no honest writer will prove a

*Rejection 'of his Jewish people' could mean no more with Mr. C. than the rejection of Tyre—Babylon, Greece, &c. Because 'his Jewish people' had only the same kind of relation.—There are only the two relations; church and national. Mr. C. says they had not the first—all then that is left for them is the second. Reader, judge for yourself.

position, from false principles: this is true of all sound books, and is beyond all dispute, when we speak of divine revelation. Suppose the Apostle had this general object in view, which Mr. C. says —there is no injustice done. This is one of Mr. C's logical proofs—he hastens the reader beyond the apostles arguments, to something—he calls the 'Apostles intention'—lest his reader might pause, and view the process of divine argument, by which the apostle came to *his* conclusion.

The whole scheme of Mr. C. on the passage is false reasoning. I observe that next to divine sovrenity, the humility of the New testament church, is the 'Apostles intention.' Read his conclusion, v. 20. 'Well: because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded, but fear.' The Apostle thus reasoned. The Old testament church was united to Christ the Head, and had received all the ordinances of the gospel—yet by its apostacy had lost its standing—its rotten branches were cut off by Christ; some few branches remained, among which were grafted in members of other nations—grafted into the same stock, partaking of the same nourishment. You must take care lest, by apostacy, you in turn, be cut off.

This tree had taken root in the covenant of grace; it was planted nigh a river; it was watered every moment. The HEAD of the church had often cut off its fruitless branches—his servants had dug about it. Notwithstanding of all that had been done, about the time that Christ paid her a personal visit, this tree bore little else than leaves; its fruitful branches were few; now, according to the decree of reprobation, Christ broke off all

the fruitless branches, and in their room grafted in Heathens: not into another stock, (as Mr. C. would have you believe,) but amongst the branches that were left standing. The few saints that Christ found on earth when he came, were living branches—they were ready to receive him—the faith of their fathers looked forward to the happy period—'Abraham saw his day afar off and was glad.' 'Moses, Samuel, David, &c.' Were branches of this tree, as were all the saints before and since the coming of Christ. The only difference, stated by the Apostle is, that the saints under the Old testament were the natural branches, while sinners called from other nations, were inserted into the same tree by grafting.

Mr. C. afraid of those inferences which common sense would draw, endeavours to *patch* his defective system——'The good olive tree, was the 'Jewish nation; the natural branches denote the 'Jews; and grafting expresses union by faith to 'Jesus Christ, the life giving root'—Well aware that some might object to this novel theory, he 'anticipates this. 'Some may object to my applying 'the same metaphor, a good Olive tree; both to 'the Jewish state and christian church.' P. 29. I acknowlege myself one of the objectors; and I think for a very good reason,—Because, the theory destroys the metaphor. While the apostle uses the figure 'good Olive tree,' and applies the same to the church, I cannot tell by what authority Mr. C. changes its very nature and applies it to the nation of the Jews. The 'olive tree' must therefore, mean two things, in their nature entirely distinct. I shall now for a moment reason on Mr. C's plan. The good olive tree in the 11th. of Rom. means the Jewish nation; this nation be-

came apostate, profane &c. In process of time, God cut off the Jewish branches, and instead thereof inserted, by grafting, the heathen converts—and, as the stock was national, and all its living circulation national, the branches inserted into this stock, of course, were made members of the Jewish nation—and therefore all christians are Jews, bound by all the Judicial laws. A man who gathers a burden of sticks on the sabbath day, must 'be stoned to death.' Christianity has been a great increase to the Jewish nation. But to rid himself of this very natural conclusion, speaking of his own comments, he says—'This only 'shows, that either in a different sense, or in a 'higher sense, the same words may be used. For 'instance, a man's children, his lands and his live 'stock, are called his property; now it is obvious 'that they are not all his property in the same sense.' Let this be granted; yet Mr. C. is not delivered from the dilemma. Because every man's children are his own in the same sense—his lands, his live stock in the same sense. If a man having children, lands, live stock, &c. would in consequence of the death of a child, adopt the child of a stranger, he would not ingraft it among his live stock, as Mr. C. supposes, but among his children, the child would not be any addition to his live stock, or his lands, but to his children. The Apostle speaks of but one olive tree, and of the branches of the same tree: but the ingrafted branches received the same sap and nourishment which those branches, belonging to the tree, received when they stood. The escape which Mr. C. tries to make, will not do with readers who possess common sense—no person will believe Mr. C. that we are engrafted into

the Jewish nation——or, in other words, that we are now Jews.

In a word, Mr. C. all you have established by every turn you take, is, that the church underwent all the change by the introduction of the New testament dispensation, that a tree would undergo, that lost some of its branches by the knife of the gardener, and had others ingrafted in their room. Yet ask a child and he will tell you, the tree is the same.

Mr. C. makes an attempt to state the relation, between Christ and the Jews. 'Jesus Christ was their relative according to the flesh.' 'He came 'unto his own (by nation) and his own received 'him not.' That Christ was their relation according to the flesh, is not denied—but the question is, had he any other than a natural, or national relation? However, in the same place Mr. C. grants 'he was federally, or by covenant their King.' P. 30. These expressions are not so improper, did Mr. C. not undeceive the reader by letting him know, that by Christ being 'federally and by covenant their king, he means so, in a 'natural or national sense'—or in plain terms he was their civil king; for, if he was their king only in a natural or national sense, then this proposition must be true, that Christ Jesus was the civil king of the Jews—He was their temporal king. The Jews have not been so much deceived in their expectations, as people have generally imagined—they expected a temporal king—Mr. C. says, this was his character. An individual Jew who held the same opinion of Christ with Mr. C. asked HIM to obtain the division of an inheritance he found, however, he was mistaken; Christ's reply was, 'man who made me a judge?' Luke 12. 14.

We say that Christ was the alone king of the church—'He was set my king upon the holy hill of Zion' Psalm 2. 6. In every age of the world he held this office without variation. 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to day and forever' Heb. 13. 8. Moses was king in Jeshurun—yet he was but a servant under Christ. Heb. 3. 5. 'and Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant,' v. 6. But Christ as a son over his own house.' Mr. C. will reply that it was a national house over which Moses was a servant, and a New testament house over which Christ was a son. This cavil may be ended by a few observations.

1st. The place on which Paul founds, his assertion respecting Christ, is evidently, Psal. 2, 6, 7, which can only respect Christ's eternal appointment, as well as his eternal sonship. The church under the Old testament, is frequently named from the hill on which the house of God stood, Zion. But Christ at the time David penned that Psalm, was a son over that house. The apostle tells us that all New testament saints belonged to the same house over which Christ was a son—read the verse. 'But Christ as a son over his own house, whose house are we, if we hold fast the Confidence: and the rejoicing of the hope, firm unto the end.'

2ndly. The position proposed to be proved by the apostle was, that Christ was superior to Moses. But if he spoke of two separate kingdoms, and contrasted their officers, it was impossible to prove the thing intended; and if he had gained the point, it would prove this, that as Christ was the king of the church, he was greater than Moses or any other general that leads armies. The powers of

the church and of the state are so very different, that no such contrast could be made.

3rdly. In whose house was Moses a servant? It was not his own property, he was only a 'servant'—The house must even by Mr. C's acknowledgment, have been Christ's—I conclude therefore, that the house over which Moses was a servant was the same over which Christ was a son. But Paul states that this house is the one to which believers, under the New testament, belonged Heb. 3. 6.

The authority king David or any other Jewish king exercised in the church, was distinct in its nature and exercise from that authority they exercised in the Jewish state—this power in the church was held from Christ as 'set king over the holy hill of Zion'—In this sense Christ is said to be the Root and offspring of David. Mr. C's theory, will in some manner, account for his being the offspring of David—but in no sense accounts for his being the Root of David.

Mr. C. will however, end the matter by one finishing stroke—'*Thou stadest by faith*, is the sole 'cause of union to the good olive, and the only 'means of participation in its roots and fatness, assigned by the apostle: and at one stroke 'cuts off the whole system which my opponent in'deavors to prove from this chapter'* page 30, 31. —I reply that 'thou standest by faith'—was as really the mode of the *standing* of old, as New testament saints. We are certain this was the mind of the apostle Paul in Heb. 11—where he men-

* To Mr C's plan of using this argument against infant Baptism, or the church membership of infants, I shall afterwards attend.

tions a considerable number of the Old testament branches, remarkable for this very faith of which Mr. C. speaks.

The passage quoted by Mr C. proves the same doctrine; Rom. 11. 20. 'Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith, be not high minded but fear'—Any just interpreter would give this paraphrase, unless it would be the death of some favorite system: Gentile converts, be humble, you only stand by faith as members of the church—the Jews once stood as you now do, but refusing credit to the everlasting gospel, were broken off. But I would ask Mr. C. if unbelief be not the contrary of faith; if faith be the uniting principle, then unbelief must be that which disunites. The church now stands united to Christ by faith—query, cannot many of her professed members be broken off by unbelief? what was the end of the seven churches of Asia? they, like us, once stood by faith—do they now so stand? no; these branches are now broken off, because of unbelief. Indeed, common sense will say, that the branches which are grafted in instead of those broken off, stand in the same sense united to the tree, those did which were broken off—in their turn may be broken off in the same manner.

But the same doctrine is established by the apostle in the same chapter. The return of the Jews, in the glory of the latter day, shall be their return to the same relation they formerly occupied, before they were broken off. They were cast away—From what?—Their national standing, says Mr. C. No—for this was in reality no loss—they might have had more civil liberty and independence as Roman citizens, than they had enjoyed for many centuries. This could be no great

evil. But the truth is, they were cast away from their relation to the church. v. 19. 'For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the reconciling of them be, but life from the dead?' Their casting away, implies their loss of their church state, and all their consequent privileges: but the receiving of them, their happy return to the same relation they formerly had, and to much greater privileges than they ever enjoyed; therefore called 'their fulness' v. 12.

The reader will do well to attend to the last clause of v. 15—'life from the dead'—In the same moral sense in which people die, they shall arise. Mr. C's theory is, they died as a nation; they will arise a church: or systematically—they died as a nation, they will arise as a nation. They were cast away as a nation—their reconciling will be the life of a nation from the dead—that is, we will have a new nation, recorded on our maps, that have been blotted out for more than eighteen hundred years. Ministers or members of the church, is this your meaning when you pray for the return of the Jews!!!

But the word '*reconciling*' used in the passage quoted, also proves the same position. When a friend is offended with us, means are used to reconcile him; when he is reconciled, he is only brought back to his former standing. The Jews were once, the friends of God—they were offended at Christ—he is called 'a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence'—'the reconciling of them' will be their restoration to their former state of friendship.

Mr. C. calls our serious attention to three decisive considerations, on this subject, page 27. 'I

'do seriously entreat all Pedo Baptists to consider 'these three facts. They are plain and decisive. 'The whole New testament is predicated upon 'them. The first of them viz. That the Jews 'were cast away and rejected, as being the peo-'ple of God* on those peculiar accounts which 'designated them 'his people,' made way for re-'conciling the world, become 'the riches of 'the Gentiles,' and introduced a new era in the 'world; the constitution of a new state of things.'

We shall reply to the separate items of this 'serious fact.' That they were cast away and rejected as a nation, is true. That this is a fact as they were the people of God, is also true. But it is equally true that they shall again be collected together as his people—This is the doctrine of the chapter from which we reason. 2ndly, made 'way for the reconciling of the world.' This is true. They, as a church, were in covenant with Christ; but this in a great measure, was confined to their nation. In the Providence of God, their nation must lose its character, & its members their church standing, to make room for the Gentile world. 3rdly. 'To introduce a new era in the world' —I suppose Mr. C. means the commencement of the christian era, 1823 years ago—no christian will

* What does Mr. C. mean by calling them 'the people of God?' He will do well in his *next book*, to distinguish between 'the people of God' and the church— either they must have been his people, as other nations were, or his people as separated from others—*i. e. eklesia*, called out from other nations. He will then satisfy Mr. Ralston &c. Mr. W. on his assertion that the church of God and of Christ is not the same.

object. 4thly. 'The constitution of a new state of things'—It by this, he means the change of the outward dispensation of grace, an increase of privileges he will still do——

His first fact has done nothing for his theory—the change has not affected the identity of the body, or contradicted any position we have been establishing.

Let us hear his 2nd. decisive fact, page 27, 28. 'That the remnant, according to the election of 'grace,' *continued* not in the former state of the Jewish nation; but become the people of God in a 'spiritual and everlasting relation, is essentially 'distinct from their former state; is the accomplishment of many promises and prophecies in 'the Old testament, and fitly characterizes the 'christian church, 'the kingdom of Heaven,' in 'comparison of the 'worldly sanctuary;' the 'Carnal commandments' and the 'beggarly elements of 'the Jewish state.' Let us examine this 'fact' in its full force. 1st. 'That the remnant, according to 'the election of grace,' &c. Those who did not believe, continued in the same national standing, that this remnant did—the civil power of the Jews, at that time, was very limited: the sceptre had departed from Judah, in a great measure, when Herod became their governor. But the remnant, according to the election of grace, no more refused their civil subordination, than the other Jews did. Paul, one of this remnant, acknowledged their power, long after he was attached to the remnant. 'I wist not brethren, that he was the High Priest; for it is written, thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.' acts 23. 5. That it was necessary in order to become one of this remnant, to throw off national allegiance, is a

new doctrine. The heathen, I grant, did urge it —even the Jews pressed this upon Christ, that he was not the friend of Cæsar. Mr. C. should not have revived their assertions. The apostles & their successors, have sufficiently answered these objections. To lose 'national character,' by receiving the character of 'Christian,' is never necessary. The friends of Christ may belong to both kingdoms—and, as far as is consistent with the moral law, yield obedience to both.

If, by 'loosing their national character,' Mr. C. means that they were willing to be incorporated with other nations; this is true; because, so long as the administration of the covenant of grace and the kingdom of Christ was confined to that nation, as a necessary precaution, to prevent corruption— such incorporation was forbidden—this is a circumstantial difference, but nothing more.

The 2nd part of this fact is, that 'this remnant, ' in a spiritual and everlasting relation,' &c. That every sinner, in the day of his conversion, whether Jew or Gentile, forms a new relation, is true. If this be the meaning of Mr. C. it is conceded. But if he means that believers under the New testament, hold any distinct relation to Christ, from that relation which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all Old testament saints had, it is denied, for reasons already given. The remaining part of the fact only regards the distinction of privileges; and, therefore, affects not the being of the church. It was, indeed, the blessing of this remnant and their successors in the church, to be delivered from the weak and beggarly elements of the Jewish dispensation—these were no longer necessary—Christ their substance was come, & appeared to 'put away

sin by the sacrifice of himself.' What is decisive in this second fact for Mr. C.?

'The third and last of these three viz. that 'Jews and Gentiles were, to a man, concluded in 'unbelief in relation to christianity, presents the 'whole world on the same footing. It presents 'Judaism and Gentilism, as both distinct from and 'essentially opposite to christianity.' P. 28. All this is materially true; and what is thereby made for his system? Christianity, I grant knows no national distinction—Jew, Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, are alike. It was not the will of the Head of the church formerly, to extend it to other nations; but from any thing in the nature of the gospel, it never knew national distinction: before the time of Abraham, it was not confined to any particular people; and even after that period, until the coming of Christ, without respect of nations, some converts were admitted, which were not only a pledge to the church at that time, that the gospel would be extended, but also proved that the nature of the gospel, as then administered, admitted of subjects from other nations. I grant that Judaism, after the death of Christ, was, in point of efficacy, no better than Gentilism; but what was it before that period? this is the question in dispute. Will Mr. C. pretend to say that the religion of the Jews, *before* that period, was no better than Gentilism? If he did not intend to prove this, I cannot understand what he intended to prove by this last assertion.

Now 'let all Pedo-Baptists,' according to Mr. C's. request, 'seriously consider these three facts' —and, when done, they will believe as before.

But if Mr. W. succeeded in proving that the Jews were, considered as a people, married to the

Lord, he has made nothing; for this relation was actually dissolved by regular divorce—and with that divorce, fell the Jewish church. Let us hear Mr. C. "As a nation, I have already shewn 'the Jews were married to the Lord, and, as a na-'tion, he divorced them. He then formed a re-'lation more close, and altogether spiritual, with 'a remnant of the Jews and a remnant of the 'Gentiles—which, as christians, he espoused to 'himself. It is not true, that the bride is the same 'now that she ever was, any more, than it is not 'true, that the christian church is similar to the 'Jews. I must refer him (viz. Mr. W.) to the 'consideration of Jer. 3. 8.' P. 54.

The marriage of Christ to a nation, is a new thought—and Mr. C. the inventor. A reader never terrified at any expression, however contrary to scripture, may admit it; I cannot. The term *marriage*, when used figuratively, is only used to designate *intimate relation*. I believe that it cannot be said, in any sound sense, that Christ is married to a nation—or is it a fact that HE ever stood more intimately related to one nation than to another, considered as a nation. It was, indeed, the alone privilege of the Jewish nation, for a long period of time, to have the church within its confines—It is all the privilege of BRITAIN and AMERICA, to possess the church. Yet a national character to the Jews, Britains and Americas was, and is distinct from their church relation to Christ, their KING and HEAD. Christ indeed stood related to many of the Jewish citizens, not as citizens, but as professing believers. He stood externally related to the Jewish nation; not as a nation, but as a nation of professors of the true religion. We have the positive assertion

of Christ in opposition to the scheme of Mr. C. 'My kingdom is not of this world.' John. 18. 36. Mr. C. will grant that a nation, considered as such, is a kingdom of this world. And if Christ stood related to the Jews as a civil kingdom, considering them as the spouse and himself as the husband, how could HE say, 'my kingdom is not of this world.'

The very passage to which Mr. C. refers his opponent, Jer. 3. 8. he should have kept a profound secret, if he intended to establish his point. The passage contains the death warrant of his system respecting the church—The truth is, there is not the least hint in the passage, of Mr. C's theory, because the prophet mentions the tribes that were cast away, as distinct from the tribe of Judah, with whom the church remained, and with whom it was found when Christ came. Read Jer. 3. 8. 'and I saw, when, for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel, committed adultery, I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce, yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not but went and played the harlot also.' It is evident to any reader, that the divorce respected 'backsliding Israel' and not 'Judah.' Before the prophet Jeremiah wrote, the other tribes were entirely seperated from the church, never to be reunited, until the fulness of the Gentile nations would come. With respect to these, the word *divorce* is used, and is a very strong declaration of their doleful state, as separated and as broken off from the church, the good Olive tree, and left to intermingle with the heathen world, and learn their ways. Mr. C. makes no mention of this fact in the text; but actually applies the term 'Divorce,' to the whole church. But perhaps, he never

read the passage with care himself. The conduct of Judah was no better than that of her sister, Israel; she took no warning by all the Divine Judgments Israel had received; yet God declares, that there was no dissolution of the relation, between him and Judah, (as Mr. C would have it) v. 14. 'Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord, for I am married unto you.' Thus, reader, you have found the premises of Mr. C's conclusion in *his* book, but not in the BIBLE.

This doctrine is certainly true, that a believer may commit the most aggravated sins—What act of prophanity was greater than Peter's? what adultery more aggravated than David's, or what Idolatry worse than Aaron's? Yet the scripture gives us no hint, that therefore, the relation between them and Christ was dessolved. The conduct of Judah, I grant was no better than the conduct of Israel; yet he refused to divorce her, but entreats her kindly to return, for he was married to her.*

3rd. 'With a remnant of the Jews and a remnant of the Gentiles he has formed a more close and spiritual union.' I beseech Mr. C. to look at this again. For what union is more close than the union of marriage? 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery but I speak concerning Christ and the church' Eph. 5. 31. 32. Of

*Mr. C's reasoning on this *Divorce*, savors too much of a wilful sophism; he must have read the passage—it seems impossible he could have mistaken its meaning—he should not wilfully mislead one ignorant reader.

whom did Paul speak in this place? It could not be of New testament saints only; because Jeremiah had said, that the Old testament church was married to the Lord; and Paul declares nothing more. The marriage between Christ and the church is so intimate, and of such a nature, that it does not admit of separation. 'I will betroth thee unto me for ever.' Hosea 2. 19—But no says Mr. C. 'they may be divorced'—'finally put away.'

5th. But this union of the New testament church to Christ, is not only more close, but is also as distinct from the union of the Old testament church—a 'spiritual union.' I would ask, what was the union, if it was not spiritual? The promise of Christ, the spiritual seed, was given to Abraham in uncircumcision, as the apostle shews; to intimate that he stood the father of the faithful, whether Jews or Gentiles. Does Mr. C. desire the reader to believe this propcsition, that the Divine Being, was united to the Jews by a carnal relation? He seems to hold this doctrine, by denying that the relation was spiritual. This shall afterwards be discussed.

We shall only observe on the passage quoted from Mr. C. that Mr. W. never did say, or even read of any one saying, that 'the christian church is similar to the Jews.' He said the Old and New testament church were the same. If they be not, Mr. C. has not given us any reason, sufficient to make us deny the assertion. He has, indeed, with eager search, discovered a great change of circumstances—a great difference in privilege, between the two dispensations; and these are not denied. But all his arguments are insufficient to make us believe they are not the same. No person can believe his system of relation, until he

proves, that a woman, when married, being found ignorant, weak, sickly, is not the same person twenty years afterwards, when her husband has instructed her, and she is now become strong and healthy.

Mr. C. has mustered up his strong facts, to which, even scripture metaphors must bow, P. 28. stubborn facts—but after investigation, even common sense refuses to bow. He creates thousands of *new* beings, every second; by his system, every change in circumstances creates *new* beings ——but these new creatures are all the product of Mr. C's brain, without any foundation, or even materials upon which he could go to work---Yet he has made one *new* church, five *new* covenants,---- one *new* Olive tree, which he calls national----then all the *new* arguments, upon which he builds the *new* system. Thus has he outstripped the prophets, the apostle, all Divine revelation with all his predecessors.

Before I leave this subject, I would invite the reader to review Mr. C's system, in its true dress. And, in order that any enquirer may judge for himself, I shall present both sides of the propositions now discussed.

Mr. C. I grant that there were saints under the Old testament.

Mr. W. Yes but they had no place of residence: no house of God; no church: further than mob-assemblies, civil meetings.*

---

* Mr. C. seems to grant in his strictures published against Mr. Ralston, that there was a church under the Old testament. But Mr. R. or Mr. W. knew of but one church, and that the church of Christ—but Mr. C. never granted that the Jews

Mr. C. Believers, under the Old testament, held communion with God—but had no communion with one another, because they did not exist in a church state.

Mr. W. The church of Christ received its first gospel address in the garden, in the cool of the day—that by this Divine sermon and those which immediately followed, a church was formed—that Noah, Aaron, and Paul, were preachers of the same church—existed in a church state—held communion with Christ—and with the saints of their age.

Mr. C. People under the Old testament, attended sermon, as a nation—as citizens they prayed, they praised—their religion consisted in a collection of civil rites. The ceremonial law was a civil law, all its purifications were only for the purpose of cleansing them as citizens—When they did not properly attend to these civil rites, in taking a civil ordinance called the *Passover*, 'Hezekiah prayed for them and they were healed."

On their sabbath days 'they transacted all manner of worldly business that did not require labor, because they had only a worldly, a natural existence----and, of course, were great enemies to moral societies. Their sanctuary was only called a worldly sanctuary, because in it they transacted worldly business.

Mr. W. the ceremonial law was the gospel of

---

originally belonged to that church—yet his concession to Mr. R. on that subject, evinces a change of mind produced either from a conviction, that he had taken false ground; or, what is more probable, he became afraid that the reader might mistake him for an infidel.

Christ, given in a legal form, had Christ crucified for its substance—mankind sinners for the persons to whom it was addressed——and eternal salvation for an important object. That Christ never had but one spouse——This was the church, the bride, the Lamb's wife, 'my dove, my undefiled is but one.' This spouse was composed of Old and New testament members—Who in all ages of the world, associated themselves together in a body, thus called the church.

Mr. C. That the nation of the Jews was not a church I can easily prove—That Christ had no church at that time is equally evident—but what they were, I cannot tell, or even yet have tried to tell.

Mr. W. It is easier to pull down than to build up—Deists have pulled down the New testament church, as Mr. C. has done the old; but they or Mr. C. never attempted to establish any thing upon the ruins of the systems they have attempted to destroy.

Mr. C. may be unwilling to admit the preceeding language as his own—although the language be not his, the sentiments are, and must appear so to every candid reader. Mr. Ralston's misrepresentations are such as every man would make that would read it attentively, and such as Mr. C. intended to make; but, when stript of the dress, and unfleeced of their wool, Mr. C. became ashamed of his own wolves.

II PROPOSITION.

That God never did enter into any covenant with fallen man but the covenant of grace, which is now, and ever was, the alone security and hope of the believer.

This covenant is defined to be a contract made from eternity, between God the father and God the son; wherein God the son did, as the fœderal head and representative of all whom the Father gave him, agree to satisfy all the claims of the law, and thereby fulfil the condition of the covenant of works, and bring in an everlasting righteousness.

That such a covenant was made, is evident, Psalm, 89, 3. "I have made a covenant with my chosen." That it was an everlasting covenant, is evident from Heb. 13, 20. Now, the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the *everlasting* covenant." That Christ was a public person in that covenant, appears from Heb. 7. 22. "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." Finally, that Christ agreed in that eternal contract to fulfil the condition of the covenant of works, and thereby satisfy all the claims of the law, is proved from Psalm 40, 6, 7, 8. Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire: mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will O my God."

But the denial of this doctrine constitutes a great part of Mr. C's work—he has been more in-

ventive in the formation of spurious covenants, than the Roman Catholicks were in sacraments—they formed three spurious sacraments, but Mr. C. has formed in his own brain, five new covenants, which he adds to the two found in the scriptures, making seven. It indeed lies upon Mr. C. to exert all his genius to create covenants; it is evident that circumcision was the seal of *some* covenant, this materially is not denied by Mr. C. although he is not willing to go so far, as Paul's opinion on the same snbject. But no person had ever asserted that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of works. It will not do for the system of Mr. C. to make it a seal of the covenant of grace; and therefore, some other covenant must be made, to which this seal can be applied—he thinks he has succeeded. We shall endeavour to collect his observations upon the subject.

'With regard to what he (Mr. W.) has said concerning the two covenants being the same, I am 'authorised, from the Old testsment and the new, 'to affirm that they are not." "On what ground 'does my opponent affirm that these covenants are 'the same, that is, what he calls the covenant of 'grace, or I, the new covenant, and the covenant 'of circumcision? Do we not read that there 'were different covenants made with Abraham? 'one called by Stephen the proto-martyr the covenant of Circumcision and one called by Paul, 'in his Epistle to the Galatians. "The covenant confirmed before of God in Christ, which 'was 430 years before the giving of the law—'Why then call those covenants the same, the 'one revealed to Abraham when 75 year old, departing from Haran, Gen. 12, 3. 430 years be

'fore the giving of the law; and the other made 'with Abraham when 99 or 100 years old Gen. 17 'called the covenant of circumcision.' Page '13, 14.'

As to the date of his two covenants, I beg leave to differ with Mr. C. for this reason, that the covenant mentioned in the 12th, of Genesis, has indeed a promise, but there is no particular mention made of any thing then instituted, as a confirmation of that covenant; the simple specification of the terms of a contract, may indeed be confirmed by the veracity of the contractors; but without a seal the contract may be said to be legally confirmed; but until the institution of circumcision we have no particular specification of a seal, or confirmation of a covenant. The calculation of Mr. David Pareus, whose character for accuracy will be disputed by none except Mr. C. before whom John Knox, justly stiled the Apostle of the reformation--or even Paul the great apostle of the Gentiles, fall with the least exertion of Mr. C's potent arm.*

He commences his calculations not as Mr. C. does from the 12th of Gen. but the 15th. From this event to the birth of Isaac 15 years, From the birth of Isaac to the birth of Jacob, 60 years, Gen. 25, 26 from the birth of Jacob, to his going down into Egypt 130 years, Gen 47, 9. From his

* When Mr. C. is passing strictures on Mr. R. the father of the reformation, gets their equal share of his 'wonder working' pen. In this respect how keenly he unites with the Papists in the ruin of these good men. It must be a pitiful system before which even the reformation must fall. Mr. C. *Inothi seauton* to know thyself.

going down into Egypt, to his death 17 years. Gen. 47, 28. From the death of Jacob to the death of Joseph 53 years. Gen 50, 26. From the death of Joseph to the birth of Moses 75 years. From the birth of Moses to the going out of the children of Israel from Egypt 80 years. In all 430 years. The time mentioned by the apostle Paul. The accuracy of this calculation will appear upon particular observation, and completely justifies the opinion of dating the time from the prophecy in Gen. Chap. 15. This covenant in that particular revelation was confirmed by sacrifice; to which we shall attend in its proper place.

But Mr. C. is 'authorized from the Old testament and the new' to declare that the covenant made before the birth of Isaac, and the covenant made at the institution of circumcision, were distinct covenants. In replying to Mr. C. I care not whether he selects for his purpose, the covenant he supposes made in the 12 chap. or the covenant mentioned in the 15th. The only difference it will make, is, that on his plan of forging out covenanants, it will place another on his list, making in all, eight.

Let us grant, that a covenant was made in the 12th chap. of Gen. What then does it contain? 1st a promise 'I will make of thee a great nation, and thou shalt be a blessing, and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed' v. 2. 3. and again v. 7, unto thy seed will I give this land. These are the only specifications of a covenant in 12th chapter. The five following things are contained in these verses. 1st, That he should be the father of a great nation. 2nd. That his name should be very celebrated. 3rd. That

God would protect his friends—and curse his enemies. 4th. That a blessing through him should extend to all the familes of the earth. 5th. That his seed should inherit the land of Canaan.

Let us next examine Mr. C's New and distinct covenant, the covenant of circumcision. This is mentioned Gen. Chap. 17. This contains 1st. a promise that his family should be great. "I will multiply thee exceedingly." 'I will make nations of thee' V. 2. 6. 2nd. With this multiplied posterity he would make an everlasting covenant. V. 8. 3rd. Circumcision is apointed as a sign, or seal of this covenant. But Mr. C. asks 'why does my opponent say that these too covenants are the same?' I answer, because they contain materially the same things. Not any blessing contained in the former covenant, but is either expressed, or implied in the latter. If we were in persuit of a new covenant, we should look for new promises, new stipulations—new parties &c.—but not finding these Mr. W. was compelled to pronounce the covenant of the 12. 15. and 17. Chap. the same. If Mr. C. had possessed a genius as productive of circumstances and principles as he was of covenants, he would at least have presented his readers with a sufficient number of these that would have inclined him to think that these were distinct covenants.

We shall however, attend to some of Mr. C's reasons, why we should consider the covenants of the 12. and 15. Chap. as distinct; and find if it be possible to consider the sentiment expressed by Mr. C. correct. I would just premise that the second or third, or any number of the revelations of a covenant will not constitute them separate contracts. This alone can be inferred, that there

were distinct reasons, why such repetitions should be made. These reasons were either the particular circumstances of the person to whom the revelation was made, or the giving of some additional revelation, either of promise, command, or threatening. Not to concede this premise, will, at least add a thousand covenants to Mr. C's seven! it will add hundreds of new commands to the common list; because we have the same precepts often repeated, according to Mr. C's plan, every repetition of the same command, will make it a distinct command. The truth is, the same covenant, the same command, is in scripture often repeated—and every repetition was made from distinct reasons, and under different circumstances. Hence the reasons given by Mr. C. for distinct covenants have nothing to do with the *being* of the covenant, they only respect the circumstances belonging to it.

'Do we not read, that there were different co-'venants made with Abraham? one called by 'Stephen, the proto-Martyr, the covenant of cir-'cumcision, and one called by Paul in his epis-'tle, to the Galatians, the covenant confirmed of 'God in Christ four hundred and thirty years be-'fore the giving of the law' P. 13. 14. That Stephen and Paul give different names to the covenant is not denied, will this, however, prove different covenants? If two writers refering to a certain contract, cite separate items, and each designate the contract, by such items, would Mr. C's conclusion be just—that therefore there must have been two contracts. The name given by Paul, (if we may call it a name:) arose from a peculiar circumstance, that it was a contract between God and the Church, concluded and con-

firmed by appending a seal four hundred and thirty years before the revelation of the law from Mt. Sinai. But Stephen speaking of the same covenant, and quoting it for a different reason, entitles it a covenant of circumcision. The different reasons, these inspired pen-men had, for refering to this covenant, of course give the different names to the same translation.

Stephen was addressing the Jews; he intimated to them their true character: that they were a people peculiarly hardened. And in order to present this to their understanding—he intimates a doctrine, they did not deny, that they were people in covenant with God, that they were yet under the obligations of this covenant, this they confessed by their acknowledgement of the rite of circumcision, because that fœderal compact between God and Abraham was the covenant of circumcision. This is the evident reason why he refers to the 17, chapter of Genesis.*

But the apostle Paul drawing his argument from the date of the covenant names it accordingly. Let it be granted, that these inspired men had respect to two seperate dates of the same covenant, what plea does this afford Mr. C? Will he think to prove from this, that they must be distinct. Yes

*It is evident Stephen was no baptist, Mr. C. says this covenant to which Stephen refers only secured the land of Canaan, but the cause for which Stephen was pleading, neither knew particular spots of the world, or yet particular nations. To have quoted the covenant of circumcision would, according to the Baptist view, have established nothing for the obligation of the church.

says Mr. C. for this plain reason. 'The one re-
'vealed to Abraham when seventy five years old,
'departing from Haran Gen. 12. 3. four hundred
'and thirty years before the giving of the law; the
'other made with Abraham, when ninety or an
'hundred years old Gen. 17. Why I say call
'these two, the *Abrahamic covenant?*" P. 14. Ans. Because the contract was made with Abraham first, when he was seventy five years old, and again repeated with some things additional when ninety nine years old. I call both the same covenant because most people deny that the simple repitition of a contract under different circumstances and for different reasons, necessarily implies a new contract—with this, common sense agrees 1st. when Abraham was first called out of Ur of the Chaldees and constituted the father of the faithful, he received the first revelation of the covenant of Grace Chap. 12. 2nd. When God revealed to him the mournful captivity to which his posterity should be reduced, HE repeats the same covenant, for the further confirmation of his faith —HE then gives an additional confirmation of the same covenant, by typically presenting to his faith the security and light of the church in the day of adversity, that while they passed through the burning fiery furnace—they should be favored with the light and comforts of the gospel. Chap. 15. 3rd. When the blessings of this same covenant were for many ages to be continued to his posterity of whom Christ was to be born, and who were also now organized as a church—HE now reveals for the third time the same covenant and for the first, appeared as a sign, or seal, the rite of circumcision.

But Mr. C. would have the reader to believe

that it was impossible that these could be the same, because of the lapse of time between the revelations made to Abraham. That the reader may judge of the strength of his arguments—we recapitulate the substance of our observations. The first revelation of the covenant of grace was made to Abraham, when seventy five years old, about ten years after when the faith of Abraham needed a peculiar confirmation the same covenant was again revealed, with the necessary additional confirmations. Lastly when this was in a great measure to be confined to his natural posterity, and it became necessary to add a seal, HE again revealed the same covenant and added circumcision. Of these covenants I may either speak in the singular or plural number: If I speak of the substance, without refering to any circumstance, I mention it in the former sense; but if I refer to the different revelations made, then with the apostle I name it in the plural—covenants.

To 'argue from them as one, and the same, is a 'blunder too glaring in this enlightened age.' 'Whatever the apostle calls them; he presses the 'same number to whom says he, pertain the cove-'nants of promise, again, to Abraham and his seed 'were the promises made. On these two cove-'nants which are of such ancient date, were the 'two dispensations founded; the Jewish and the 'Christian.' P. 20. Such round assertions deserve clear argument, or else the reader will be disposed to say; we have nothing but assertion, and indeed such a conclusion appears evident. When Mr. C. does not even attempt either to form the distinct nature or substance of covenants, from which to draw his new-fashioned conclusion.

We grant, that the covenant of grace has many promises, even every gospel promise contained in the Bible. When the apostle spoke of these promises he mentioned them in the plural number, or when he dissignated the covenant by the different revelations—or the numerous promises it contained, he uses the plural number—but who will hence infer, that there was a plurality of covenants.

That the Jews derived their blessings from the covenant of circumcision is also true; but when we attend to the particular specifications revealed to Abraham in that covenant; even the slightest attention will render it evident, that other nations were equally included. Gen. 17. 5. 'Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations, have I made thee,' v. 15. 16. 'And God said unto Abraham, as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall be her name. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her, yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of he' It is obvious that in this covenant of circumcision, Abraham was constituted the father of the faithful; the 'nations born in a day' should, from the items of this contract be constituted his seed, and of course, Christians in all ages of the world, will be founded upon this covenant.

Although we grant that the New testament is founded upon the covenant mentioned in the 12th. Chap. yet we deny that this dispensation is exclusively founded upon that revelation of it. Were we so prolific of covenants as Mr. C. we would however, deny that the New testament church, was founded upon the revelation, mentioned in

the 12th. Chap. and assert that it was upon the covenant of circumcision, we are founded From the passages just quoted, it is evident that in the covenant of circumcision, such names were given to the covenanters, as rendered it evident, they were the church in a foederal sense, why was Abram called Abraham? because he was to be the father of nations, or Sarai, Sarah? because she was to be the mother of nations. If the reader enquire upon what covenant believing nations are founded. I answer upon that covenant in which Abraham was constituted their father—which fact took place in the covenant of circumcision. Gen. 17.

Another circumstance rendering the same doctrine more obvious, is that in the same covenant, Isaac was promised. This son was the person by whom Abraham became related to the heathen nations, who would become converts to the religion of Jesus. These are the children of Abraham in the same spiritual sense, Isaac was. The apostle Paul, who certainly agrees with the view I have given—lays down the same assertion, and for the proof of it, quotes the covenant of circumcision Rom. 9, 7. 'Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called.' The apostle quotes Gen. 17, 19, a part of the covenant of circumcisions, it remains evident that upon this covenant the apostle founded that relation which all believing nations have since claimed to Abraham. Now let Mr. C. settle this point with the apostle Paul.

I shall mention another reason why the opinion of Mr. C. respecting this covenant must be absurd. I mean the term by which it is expressed

in Gen. 17, *everlasting covenant* than which no stronger term can be used to express the covenant of grace. But lest this scripture *appellation* of Mr. C's. Jewish covenant might carry too much conviction, he easily passes over the difficulty, by declaring that the word *everlasting* is used in a limited sense in scripture; I answer that the term *everlasting*, means duration without end—this is its literal and only meaning, and is never otherwise used except in figure. Mr. C. calls this play upon the word *everlasting*, page, 52. 'The term *ever-* ' *lasting* is often used as a relative term in the ' scripture, and in the very chapter in which the ' covenant of circumcision, is called an everlasting ' covenant, in their flesh, we have the term so ' used v. 8. 'and I will give the land of Canaan for ' an everlasting possession.' In this he presents his reader with two reasons why the term *everlasting* cannot mean *forever*. The 1st is that it was to be an everlasting covenant in their flesh—and therefore could not outlive their flesh. The 2nd is that the land of Canaan was given for an everlasting possession which could not continue any longer than the time of the Jews inhabiting that land.

Let it be observed as a fact, that Mr. C. and the Universalists, convert the meaning of the word *everlasting*, to signify a limited time, just as it serves their respective purposes. The Universalian says, that the term, everlasting, means eternity when applied to the future happiness of saints, but when applied to future punishment, it is taken in a limited sense; to the feelings of the human mind, the one is admissible, but the other too painful to be admitted. So Mr. C. will admit this *term* in its full sense, if applied to the New testament church; for

his system is not thereby injured: but if it be applied to the privileges of the saints under the Old testament, and especially to a covenant to which circumcision is appended; then it can only mean a few years.

That the term *everlasting* is used in a limited sense I have granted, but have also observed that it is only so used when in figure: for example, hills are called *everlasting* Gen. 49, 26. Yet Mr. C. will grant that it would be very absurd, to draw literal conclusions, that depend upon terms figuratively used. Upon the principles established by Mr. C. in his reasoning upon the term *everlasting*, I establish this theory, that the word *river* only means drops of water, occasionally falling, because the Psalmist David declares that, '*rivers* of waters run down from his eyes.' If we endeavour to establish any position, from the use of the word *everlasting* in scripture, its figurative application is immediately presented by an Universalian or by Mr. C. After all their efforts they succeed in establishing this assertion only—that the word *everlasting*, when figuratively used is taken in a limited sense. But let me ask any Baptist of common sense, what is the meaning of the word *everlasting*? he replies—forever, eternal, duration without end. I am afraid, therefore, when Mr. C. endeavours to hide himself behind this figure, that some farmer will chase him from behind it, and expose his retreat to the world. The place to which Mr. C. refers, respecting the *Jewish* covenant, is a simple statement, and therefore the word *everlasting* must have its simple meaning. To give an honest explanation of such passages of scripture, every word must have its proper and natural significa-

tion. It is therefore Mr. C. and not Mr. W. that plays upon the word everlasting.

That the land of Canaan was given to them for a token of an everlasting possession, should be admitted, it could only be in this sense, they were to possess it forever. So Paul reasons upon the promises of this land, originally made to the Jews, in Heb. 4. He shews that it was given to them for a rest, but not for the only rest. v. 8. 'For if Jesus (Joshua) had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day.' It was with the rest of Canaan as it is with the sabbath, a figure of an eternal rest. Such indeed are all temporal blessings to God's people, they are a token, an earnest of spiritual favors, to be eternally enjoyed with God in the heavens. In this sense Israel received the earthly Canaan for an everlasting possession: the order was first an earthly, then an heavenly Canaan, the first a figure, the second a reality; righteously to enjoy the former was to possess the latter in figure.

We shall now call the attention of the reader to Mr. C's. observations on Gen. 17. 13, 17. 'He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh, for an everlasting covenant.' Hear his comment. 'But so 'long as they continued in that covenant, were 'they to enjoy that land: nor could they have a 'covenant in their flesh which would last longer 'than their flesh.' page 52.

The most obvious meaning of this passage is 1st that the covenant which God made with Abraham had a sign or a seal, that this sign was marked in the flesh; by which it might be discovered that he and his seed were a people in covenant with God.

2nd. That the blessings of this covenant, the sign of which was marked in the flesh of Abraham and in the flesh of his seed, were to be everlasting. The matter of which covenant was expressed v. 7. 'To be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.'

3rd. That the conclusion drawn by Mr. C. must be false, is indeed self evident, because a covenant or contract may last long after the seal, or the evidences of it are done: e. g. The grandfather of Mr. C. bought and afterwards occupied a farm, the contract has not lost its evidences and seals; yet his grandson Mr. C. occupies the same inheritance and that by the same contract: and upon the same principle, his posterity may occupy it for a thousand years. So the Israelite while he lived, carried with him the seal or token of this covenant, and being found in Christ when he died, he went to heaven to reap its everlasting fruits. Thus he went to an everlasting rest to enjoy the blessings of the covenant of grace which were sealed in his flesh, while he was in this world.*

We have now succeeded in either adding one more covenant to Mr. C's seven, or reducing their

*Mr C's reveling mode of argument often runs him against common sense—so eager is he to prove that the term *everlasting* only means some short time, for fear of its true meaning being applied to the covenant of circumcision, that he attempts to establish this position, that the obligations and privileges of all contracts continue only as long as the mark or seal on the paper continue. This covenant could continue no longer than the flesh. Upon his principle there is not a man in England holds any lands by just title; for although

number to six. The reduction is the most probable. So far as the stipulations are revealed to us, we find no reason to depart from the common faith of the church upon this point: and indeed we think it extraordinary any one should. In Gen. 12. we have the first revelation of the promise. We have the same renewed and confirmed by sacrifice in the 15 chap. and this sacrifice to be performed under such circumstances, and with such rites, as to intimate to Abraham the sorrows of his offspring; yet, however great their troubles were to be, this covenant should exist in its full force and and be their security; therefore a 'smoaking furnace and burning lamp' passed between the cut pieces of the sacrifice. We have still the same promise, but more fully revealed in the 17 chapter. But here the covenant was not to be confirmed by sacrifice; as in the 15 chap. or merely its promises committed to his memory, but a lasting memorial of it engraven in his flesh, in the rite of circumcision.

In my turn, I would now ask Mr. C. why not call these covenants the same. One Lord proposing it, one body, with whom the covenant was made, the

---

the titles may be preserved on record, yet this is not the signature of the contractors, it is only a proof that such covenants did exist; the rite of circumcision may be lost, and therefore this seal of the covenant of grace is no more. Will Mr. C. say that therefore the moral obligations and privileges of that transaction are also done while yet a faithful record of the covenant and seal is found in the word of God, and the moral obligations of the contract remaining, and the spiritual privileges of it still dispensed?

same blessings always promised, even blessings temporal and spiritual. Why, Mr. C. not call these covenants the Abrahamic covenant, when, in the first making, as well as in the renewal of this covenant he sustained his fœderal or representative character, he made and renewed it as the 'Father of the faithful?'

But will Mr. C. still insist that 4 or 5 covenants were made with Abraham, as many with Isaac and with Jacob? Then I invite the reader to compare the view he has given us of these covenants, with the representation God himself has given us, in Psal. 105. 8, 9, 10. 'He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word he commanded to a thousand generations: which covenant he made with Abraham and his oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto Jacob, for a law, and unto Israel for an everlasting covenant.' This covenant even by Mr. C's concession, was the covenant of circumcision. It promised the earthly Canaan, v. 11. This possession in the revelation of that covenant was secured upon the same precise principles that the same covenant in its present administration gives us our *bread* and makes our *water* sure—and this given to us for the same reason it was given to them, mentioned in the same Psalm, to enable us to discharge our duty, v. 45. 'That they might observe his statutes and keep his laws.'

Mr. C. attacks the Pedo-Baptists with an host of arguments, founded, as he supposes, upon the 8th. of Heb. and musters up almost every verse in the chapter to his aid. P. 38, 39, 40. Before we present you with a reply to his observations we would premise: that there is an artful way of running over scripture, either in order to form a

party from among those who never read it with interest, or concern, and who indeed prefer any carnal light to Divine revelation; or else to delude the ignorant and well intending part of mankind. Thus the followers of Immanuel Swedenburger, prefer his wild delirium, to any doctrines however fairly laid upon scripture; they prefer the dream of a fanatic to the solid declarations of God's word.

It is in this manner Mr. C. plays upon a few deluded people. When he finds it necessary he suffers his inventive mind to create scripture as we have shown in the General observations on his work. If the literal expressions of scripture seem to answer his purpose, he urges it—and heaps anathemas upon the man who deserts it. When you succeed in binding him fast with *express letter* —he instantly musters a pile of Lexicons as in P. 151. By these he succeeds in proving that the words used in scripture cannot mean what every English reader would suppose. Thus Proteus-like, you catch him in one shape, he escapes in another; and all to support his *novel* theory. Were it not, that it is impossible to tell how far a person may be deluded, I could not think that even Mr. C. believed the comment he has given us on the 8th. of Heb.

Dr. Gill, an eminent Baptist, has given us a very large comment upon the scriptures. On almost every verse he gives us a great variety of sentiment, and presents his readers with different opinions—Mr. C's system was not invented before the time of Dr. Gill, and with all his variety he never names the opinion of Mr. C. We shall present you with a short extract from the Dr. upon the Chapter from which we dispute, that you

may compare the sentiments of the learned Baptist with his successor Mr. C. 'The words are 'cited from Jer. 31. 32. in which God promises a 'new covenant, so called not because new made; 'for with respect to its original constitution, it 'was made from eternity; Christ the mediater of 'it, and with whom it was made, was set up from 'everlasting, and promises and blessings of grace 'were put into his hands before the world began: 'nor is it merely revealed, for it was made known 'to Adam, and in some measure to all the Old tes-'tament saints, though *it is* more clearly revealed 'than *it was*; but it is so called in distinction 'from the administration of it, which is waxen 'old and vanished away.' Dr. Gill or Mr. Boothe, Baptists of the old school, would have been offended with the views of our modern disputant, and no doubts would have saved Pedo-baptists the trouble of replying—we shall however give you his opinion.

In order to present fairly to the reader the view of Mr. C. on this chapter, in order to give a reply—we shall give you a summary view of the reasons why these covenants cannot be the same.

1st. Because it is called in that chapter a better covenant, established upon better promises. v. 6. 7. The first was faulty—the second faultless.

2nd. Because the covenant promised in Jer. 31. is called a new-covenant and the covenant which he would make with the New testament saints, would not be according to the covenant he made with their fathers, v. 8. 9.

3rd. From the items of the covenant itself v. 10, 11, 12. which covenants differ in four respects 1st. The law of the first was written on stones. The second upon the heart. 2nd. In the first he

was their God in a national sense; but in the second in a spiritual and eternal sense. 3rd. It was necessary to teach the subjects of the old, to know the Lord, but the subjects of the new are all taught of God. 4th. No remission of sins was promised to the subjects of the old as such; but to the subjects of the new as such is the forgiveness of sins promised.

4th. Because the first covenant waxed old and vanished away.

We shall now attend to these objections, in the order of the summary given. The New testament is called a better covenant for three reasons. 1st. The change of priesthood—2nd. It is established upon better promises.—3rd. It is faultless. To the first of these I reply, that the New testament is better administered than the Old, because Christ himself is the high priest, and his own body the sacrifice. But this covenant under the former administration, was executed by persons who were only typical of this high priest: these were falible, changeable, and mortal men. Christ the *antitypical* person in the 'fullness of time appeared.' 'He entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.' The word used by the apostle is *dia the ke* justly translated a will or a testament. 'Because' says Mr. C. of its 'being the usual name for the will, disposition, or 'arrangement, which is rendered valid by his 'death.' This definition is just; I would therefore ask Mr. C. if the change of the administrators of a testament will change the *will* itself? I answer. no—if those administrators refuse to serve, that have been appointed, or if they die in the midst of execution; other administrators are appointed; but not another will made, as Mr. C. would have

it. The extent of the apostle's reasoning in the chapter cited, only proves that the change of priesthood, made by the coming of Christ, secures a better administration to the New testament, than our fellow-heirs had under the former dispensation. It is not possible that any reader acquainted with the common transactions of life, or the administration of *wills*, can credit Mr. C's explanation of Paul's words.

2nd. Reason why the covenants cannot be the same. The NEW is established upon better promises than the OLD. Although we should admit all Mr. C. says upon this reason, in its fullest extent, what would it establish for his theory? nothing but that which is conceded. That the heirs to whom this testament was first administered, frequently received their promises through types, is conceded; these favors were oft given to them wrapt in thick vails; through which their faith had to penetrate, in order to reach the promise. These types, this vail, is removed, and the heirs have now more ready access to the same *will*: Mr. C's inference, 'therefore the covenants connot be the same'—is without a premise. Again, reader, admire Mr C's ingenuity. Because in process of time and change of circumstances, heirs have more convenient access to the benefits bequeathed them by their common FATHER, and of consequence more enjoyment in the possession of these blessings than those had, who were the first heirs—he takes it for a natural consequence that therefore the will cannot be the same. Who can subscribe his creed?

3rd. Reason. The first covenant was faulty—the second faultless. I reply, that Mr. C. will not suppose that there were any immoralities

in the first covenant. The DIVINE BEING was a party; fault (comparative defect) indeed was found; with the administration, it was dark, cloudy, veiled, and also the administrators of that dispensation were found guilty in not believing the promises of that covenant, and refusing to obey its law. Both these are conceded.

Fault was found either with the covenant itself, or with the administration. It could not be with the former, without blasphemy, it cannot be alledged that fault can be found with any covenant of which God is a party, its law was divine and for that time was as positive in its injunctions, as 'thou shalt not kill.' The ceremonial law which was the law of that dispensation, an existing command founded upon the Divine will, possesses all the obligation of a command, founded upon the Divine nature, although the former of these may be repealed or changed by the DEITY, yet while enjoined, they possess the force and perfection of the *moral law.*

It could not be the substance with which the fault was found, because these were blessings drawn from the divine bounty, by those to whom God, in that covenant had promised, that 'he would be their God and the God of their seed.' It follows that the *fault* was found only with the dispensation, which I have shewn did not affect the being of the covenant, the only thing in dispute.*

*For the satisfaction of Mr. C's Disciples we shall give them a summary of his three reasons why the Old and New-testament cannot be the same covenant.

B and C were the sons of A. When A their father

Objection 2nd. Comprehends two things. 1st. The first covenant was old, the second new. 2nd. The new covenant was not to be according to the old.

To the first of these I reply that the present dispensation is called a new covenant for one of two reasons—the first of these must be, that the *covenant* or will, must be entirely new, this however, is impossible; the promises of that covenant which were made unto the fathers, its first heirs, were confirmed by the death of the testator of the new-testament. Rom. 15. 8. Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.' I would now ask Mr C. If one testator can by his death confirm two distinct wills? he must answer, No; however numerous the items

---

died he left them equal shares of a very large estate. B was the oldest and come first into the possession of the estate. There were, however, three difficulties that B had to encounter. 1st He was inexperienced, there were many things he could not understand. 2nd. The administrators through whom B had to look for his estate, were also ignorant, and, in many instances, not faithful. 3rd. In the early times in which B come into the possession of his estate, none were capable of making him understand the *will*—B was often perplexed, and had but little comfort. But when his younger brother become of age, the will was understood; the first administrators dead, and a full regulation of wills fixed in law—Now because of these circumstancial differences, who will say that B and C were not brothers, or. the will *one*? Does Mr. C. believe himself that they were not?

of one will may be, the testament is but *one*, every *item* is confirmed by the death of the testator, as truly as if each were a separate *will*. Numerous promises, indeed, belonged to the covenant of grace in either of its administrations: the fathers of the Jews to whom the apostle wrote, were heirs of that covenant; the promises made to them, were inferior with respect to evidence to those made since—yet they were confirmed by the death of Christ the testator, and, by fair consequence, they were the promises of *our* covenant, confirmed to them and us by the 'once offering up of himself.'

But 'the new covenant was not to be according to the old'. This is Mr. C's 2nd. reason. I ask why it was not to be according to it? Was it in the enjoyment of God by faith? No: for while the evidence of their faith was inferior to ours; yet the being of this *grace* was secured to the subjects of that dispensation, in the very revelation of the covenant. 'I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be aGod unto thee and thy seed after thee.' In what respect then did they differ? Answer only in the adminstration, which is granted.

We now come to Mr. C's third reason, why these covenants cannot be the same, viz. That the items of the covenants were not the same. 1st. 'The law of the first covenant was written on stone'—the law "of the second on the heart". This is an unexpected concession, that the law written on stone was the same which was written on our hearts under the New testament. As the only dispute is respecting the law, I care not where he finds it written, on posts, parchment, stones, or flesh. Is the law written on stone the same that is written on

the heart? then my position stands unimpaired. I think the weakest reader will be unwilling to establish this proposition, that the new and old covenants were not one, because they had the same law. Mr. C. has joined a wrong link into this part of his chain.

The truth is that the same law which was first written on the heart of Adam, was afterwards written by its divine author on tables of stone; and is now written by the same law-giver on the hearts of his people. But if we attach any meaning to Mr C's observations on this part of his subject, it is, that this law was, under the Old testament, only written on stone, for he intends by this assertion to establish an essential difference between the two covenants. Query, was not this law written on the hearts of Old testament saints? Mr. C. thinks not; he supposes it was only written on *stone* at that time, but now it is written on the heart. Let us ask an inspired Old testament saint. Psal. 40, 8. "Yea thy law is written in my heart." No, says Mr. C. it was at that time written on stones, lying in the ark—another query: Where was the law of Old testament saints, after the Chaldean, burnt the house of God and the ark? The truth is, under the former dispensation it was written on tables of stone, and also on the hearts of the saints of that dispensation. Under the New testament it is written on paper, and also on the hearts of all believers. Mr. C. are you not wearied of this item?*

*It is something curious, to read Mr. C's view expressed in this first. item. Page. 40. "In the 'first, the laws were written on tables of stone, and 'as Moses broke the stones, so the people broke 'the laws. In the 2nd. or new, they are written

2nd. Item. 'HE was their God in a national and temporal sense. But in the 2nd. covenant HE was their God in a spiritual and eternal sense.'

The first assertion of this item, if he means God essentially considered, He was the God of the Jews in a national & temporal sense, it is conceded. But in this very far advanced state of the new testament church, he is the God of saints in a national and temporal sense—this never effects the covenant of Grace or either dispensation of it. But this is not the matter at *issue.* The question is—was Jesus ever the saviour of any nation, as such? —or even God as father, the Father of any nation as such? I think no Baptist will answer in the affirmative. Was he not the saviour of all those under that dispensation that believed? Whether then, or yet, is there any 'other name given under heaven or among men, whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus?' His true hypothesis is, God stood revealed only as a sovereign

---

' on the hearts of all the subjects, consequently ' cannot be broken." *i. e.* A law written on stones may be broken, as easily as Moses broke the stones, but a law written on the heart cannot be broken. I suppose Mr. C. must mean by breaking a law, transgressing its precepts—heathen have not this law, written on paper, nor on stones, they have it only on their hearts, Rom. 2, 15, 'which shew the work of the law written in their hearts;' they cannot therefore break the law, or in a word, it is impossible now to sin, because in a greater or less degree, every person has now the law written in their hearts! This is liberty for those who can believe it.

to saints, under the Old testament; while indeed he is the father of saints, since the death of Christ. Those Hopkinsians who deny that an atonement was essentially necessary to salvation—Socinians that an expiatory sacrifice was rendered to the law and justice of God, might, with some appearance of consistency, maintain Mr. C's theory. Yet I think no Baptist will.

Let us take another look at this *new* theory. God once saved men as civil citizens—but now HE saves them as adopted children; *i. e.* HE saved the Jews as he now would save the savages, without sending them the Gospel; because these stand related to God in as strong a national sense as the Jews did. I am not doing the opinion of Mr. C. any injustice, because he gives this item as a distinguishing charateristic between the Jewish believers and us.

The second part of this item, that we are now God's people in a spiritual and eternal sense, is not denied; but if this assertion made any thing for Mr. C. he must have meant, that believers under the Old testament, were not his, in a spiritual and eternal sense. Was this the idea, the spirit of God, by the apostle Paul, intended to convey in his Epistle to the Heb. in giving us that list of Old testament worthies? But Mr. C. does believe that some saints, did exist under the Old testament; were these not the children of God in a spiritual and eternal sense. Were they united together as a body? if they were so united—they were a church—even the conclusion in some sense, he concedes, yet when the reader endeavours to follow his sentiments—these saints come out a national, carnal. temporal church, or a people *'called out'* of the world—as one nation is called out of

another, and existing separately, acquires a distinct national character. The people had a law, it was written on tables of stone, but not on their hearts. They were saints, but only in a national and temporal sense!

3rd. Item. 'The subjects of the old covenant required to be taught to know the Lord, but the subjects of the new, are all taught of God.'

This item is expressed in that form that is found decisive: strip it of its thin dress and you will see its true character—then, reader, judge for yourself. Under the Old testament, parents had to send their children to school, to learn them to read, priests had to explain the law, parents had to teach their children its statutes, sitting down, rising up, by the way, &c. as lawful means to learn them to know the Lord. But under the present dispensation, this is unnecessary, the Divine Being, according to Mr. C. has forbid all education· this doctrine will be very agreeable to those parents who never teach their children to read. This must be the meaning of Mr. C. or why does he give the means of acquiring knowledge under the two dispensations, as a reason why the covenants cannot be one.

The passage of scripture to which Mr. C. refers, 'They shall all be taught of God,' must be understood as meaning one of three things; either that new testament saints are miraculously filled with knowledge, without the use of means—That they are savingly taught by the spirit of God, in the sanctification of their knowlege—or that the removal of shadows from the dispensation of Grace, rendered the means of knowlege easy, and Gospel instruction plain. The first of them was true on the day of Pentecost, and for some time

after. The second will apply to saints under both dispensations. And the third will only prove the superiority of the new covenant, which is conceded. But will either of these prove a distinct covenant? No—it only establishes this assertion, that the heirs of the second dispensation of this covenant, have an opportunity of more clearly understanding their testament, than their fellow heirs had who lived under the former. The spirit of God taught then, as it teaches yet, but the means of grace, lie more clearly before the human understanding now, than they did at that time. Mr. C. fails by this item, in proving distinct covenants.

4th. Item. 'No remission of sins promised to Old testament saints, as such; but to the subjects of New testament saints, as such, forgiveness is promised.' P. 40.

What idea Mr. C. intends to convey by the clause *as such*; is difficult to tell. I may not do him justice when I attach that meaning to his words, which every reader must do. I consider that the clause cannot have any sound meaning; if forgiveness was not promised to them as members of the former dispensation, it could not be promised to them in any sense, for they lived under no other dispensation. If he means that forgiveness was not promised to them as civil citizens, then the clause was *useless*, because no person then, or yet obtains the pardon of sin in any other sense, than as the children of God, in union with Christ. The third and only meaning can be, that Old testament saints did not obtain the pardon of sin in any sense.

Nathan told David, 'the Lord hath put away thy sin;' not as a New testament member, for this he

was not, but as *one* in covenant with God. There never was but one way of obtaining forgiveness of sins, i. e. through the blood of an all-atoning sacrifice. The covenant which Mr. C. calls their 'National covenant.' P. 167, promised mercy: Exodus 20. 6· 'Shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.' It is the opinion of Mr. C. that this Sinai covenant contained nothing more or less than that which was written on the two tables of stone. P. 166* Be it so, and my quotation is a part of that which belongs to this *national covenant.* Then I would ask, how can God shew mercy without pardoning sin? But this declaration, is made to the subjects

*When we speak of the Sinai covenant, we 'cannot scripturally include one word more in it, 'than what was written on the two tables. See-'ing both Moses and Paul have so restricted it.'

It was not my intention to notice every absurdity in Mr. C's book, for many of them are too plain to do much harm, but he is so positive in this place, that an unsuspicious reader might take it for granted, that he was right—lest this might be so, I would inform the reader, that neither Moses nor Paul so restricted it. I suppose Mr. C. who is but a late writer, is the first that so restricted it. It is conceded that the ten conmandments contained the *substance* of the law of that covenant, but we say it contained no more, and the scripture asserts no further. It was called the *ark of the covenant* because it contained a summary of that law, which believers are, by covenant, bound to obey. But that the whole of the covenant was written upon the tables, has no higher authority than Mr C.

of the covenant, as such, therefore the subjects of that covenant, as such, did receive the pardon of their sins. Look again at Mr. C's assersion 'to the subjects of that covenant, as such, the forgiveness of sin was not promised;' with this compare a declaration made to the subjects of that dispensation, as such, at the very time of delivering the judicial and ceremonial law. Exodus 34, 6, 7. 'The LORD, the LORD GOD, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth. Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin.' Reader, observe, this is an item of Mr. C's—national covenant—these were the people to whom the pardon of sin was not promised.

4th Reason. 'The first covenant waxed old and vanished away.' page 40 41. In the pages cited, he calls the former covenant *musty, moth-eaten, &c.* When Mr. C. used such expressions at the time of the public debate, I was indeed astonished, that a person who desired the world to take him for a minister, would be guilty of such a profane expression; but I now think him more inexcusable, when in the cool moments of composition, he still uses them. Is it not, reader, a pity to hear one who makes some kind of a professesion of Christianity, however far it is from the truth, use such degrading expressions of any covenant, of which the eternal God was a party. Reader blot those expressions out of your memory.

For the justification of this reason he calls your attention to Heb. 8, 13. 'In that he saith a new covenant, he made the first old, now that which decayeth, and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.' The question is, to what does the apostle refer in this verse? Either he must mean that the covenant,

in its very *being* waxed old, and was ready to vanish away, or else he speaks of the dispensation of it; it cannot be the former, and therefore it must be the latter. It cannot be the former; because:

1st. The covenant conveyed and secured blessings, spiritual and eternal—God had promised to be the God of Abraham, and the God of his seed, these were to continue before him forever. It was called, as we have shewn, an everlasting covenant; by this covenant, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are now in heaven. This is, and shall remain, their residence, Matt. 22, 32. Were the doctrine of Mr C. true, then indeed closed all the blessings, and all the privileges of any contract God ever made with the Jews, as his people. It is remarkable, however, that Peter revives one of Mr. C's *musty*, *moth-eaten* promises, on the day of Pentecost, when the blaze of the New testament shot forth, on which day thousands were added to the family of Abraham. They were Christ's, and therefore Abraham's seed.

2nd. Christ was the substance of all their shadows. Heb. 10. 1. But as Christ, the substance, the blessed SUN, began to rise, the shadows began to disappear, and to 'vanish away.' This had a reference to the outward rituals of the church alone. they were all the subjects of sense. The church, even then, and long before that time, anxiously looked for the time when these shadows should 'vanish away,' while, for that time, they were to them a medium, through which they held communion with God. Their resolution is expressed Song. 4. 6. 'Until the day break & the shadows flee away, I will get me to the mountain of Myrrh, and to the hill of frankincense.'

3rd. There were two things that rendered the covenant unchangeable, the blessings it contained, and the parties contracting: to the former I have spoken at length. On the last of these, I would observe, that this covenant was first made between the Father and the Son. Christ in that eternal contract was a fœderal head. Therefore this covenant was between the Father and, through Christ, with the church; the Father is unchangeable—'I am the Lord, I change not.' The son is unchangeable 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to day, and forever' The church, politically considered, is also one. 'My dove my undefiled is but one.' This party shall continue forever. Psal. 102. 28. The children of thy servants shall continue,' the church shall 'ever be with the Lord.'

There are covenant vows which secure to her the eternal possession of blessings, and of this Old testament covenant, God has promised that he will ever be mindful Psal. 11, 5. Then I infer that a covenant, the parties and the promises of which will exist forever, is a covenant that cannot wax old, and cannot vanish away.

We grant that true religion was about departing from the Jews when Christ came; the sceptre was droping from the hand of Judah, when HE lifted it up, the traditions of men are supplanting Divine revelation, these are truths; but they cannot be learned from the passage to which Mr. C. refers.

It follows by native inference that the dispensation of grace, which comprehends the external rites peculiar to that dispensation, were the only parts of that covenant that 'waxed old' 'vanished away.'

Mr. C. for once, having found an argument that he supposes may be seen, invites Pedo-Baptists up to the sight. 'Oh! That every Pedo-Baptist would 'remember it: it should forever silence my oppo-'nent on these topics, it reads thus. In that he 'sayeth a new covenant he hath made the first old. '—Now THAT which is old is ready to vanish away.' Page 40—Now, what has Pedo-Baptists discovered in the text? That beyond all doubt it proves that the ceremonies and all things peculiar to the outward dispensation of the old covenant, 'waxed old and were ready to vanish away' an important discovery! yet known to all you Pedo-Baptists from your childhood, from the time your parents taught you that question: 'How many covenants are there?' Our argument founded upon the 8th of the Heb. remains untouched. While Mr. C. is quite exhausted, fighting his shadow, yet he has this satisfaction, that he has played upon the inattentive reader, from the only circumstance that the word *covenants* is mentioned; which he would have you to believe respected the *being*, not the *external parts* of that covenant. The reader will perceive that the only difference Mr. C. has yet succeeded in establishing, is, that there were different dispensations to the same covenant.

In page 70 Mr. C. proposes Mr. W. Three *intricate* and *pertinent* questions, that without doubt must bring a decision 'in his favor, on the subject of the covenants.

1st, 'Are they the same, in respect of the 'nature and extent of the privileges secured to 'the respective subjects, under each of these cov-'enants.'

2nd. 'Are they the same in respect of the inte-

'resting, or entitling condition; that is, is the 'ground of interest and of claim, the same in both?'

3rd. 'Is the condition of the continued enjoy-'ment of the covenanted blessings, the same in 'both covenants?'

To the first of these I reply, essentially considered, they are, but as it respects their external privileges they are not. For the illustration of which, I observe,

1st. That the faith of the subjects of each covenant was the same. Christ was the alone and proper object of faith, under both dispensations. 'For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' 1. Cor. 3, 11. There never was any other superstructure of mercy, than the church, and it was built on this foundation—for this faith many of the Old testament saints were famous. If Christ be refused by Mr. C. to be the object of their faith, and ground of their atonement; what will he choose? their sacrifices will not do, they were an object of sense, not of faith; they will not do for a ground of atonement; David in Psal. 51. would have given them for this purpose, but found they would not do. v. 16. 'For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt offering.' It was in consideration of this, that Christ said to the subjects of the former dispensation: 'Lo I come' Psal. 40. Their prophets all taught them to look beyond their sacrifices. Acts. 3, 18.' 'But these things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.'

Their faith and hope united in him, this was the language of Old testament saints. 'But he was

wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: The chastisement of our peace *was* upon him, and with his stripes we are healed' Isaiah 53. 5.

3rd. In both these covenants there is a security given for spiritual and temporal blessings, that the first contained spiritual blessings, I think is proven. The relation subsisting between God and them secured the continued possession of these blessings—this relation, the basis of all their blessings, was promised in the very covenant now in dispute, viz. the covenant of circumcision. I will 'be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.' This relation God was to sustain, for the special purpose of securing them the blessings contained in that covenant. That the same dispensation secured temporal blessings, is not denied.

That the new covenant secures both these blessings, will also appear. That it secures spiritual blessings is not denied. That it secures a right to temporal blessings, Mr. C. does not deny; he only sports a little upon the subject, page 78, and this in order to call the attention of the reader from the subject, lest they unhappily see the breach in the link of his chain.*

* It is remarkable that Mr. C. for the satisfaction of his own mind, although he disregarded the requests of the intelligent reader, did not attempt to tell us in what manner believers were under the New testament, made partakers of temporal good things; had he attempted this, I grant, it might have discovered to his mind that uniformity which in this respect, existed between the two covenants—No—he must have one all carnal, the other all spiritual. This best suits his purpose.

In addition to the observations made on our first proposition on promises: "Bread shall be given and your water made sure;' 'Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth' &c. Intimate that God as Father, has graciously condescended to his people, to secure them a right to temporal blessings. He not only bestows them without a curse, but with a covenant security: these blessings in every sense are theirs. The covenant of grace makes all its subjects free, the heirs of this Divine *testator* are free in time and in eternity, 'whom the son makes free are free indeed.' They are not only delivered from the covenant of works and all its curses, but from the world and all servile obligations to it. They are therefore the only persons who inherit the earth.

2nd. There is no difference with respect to covenant title which a believer has to the farm on which he lives, and the right which a believer had to his possessions in the land of Caanan, under the former dispensation. They are both inheritors of the earth, as Abraham's seed. 'If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed.' The Divine promise is the title the Jews had to the land of Caanan, our title is the same.

Mr. C. page 79, attempts to give us the difference of the two titles; the claim of the Old testament subject was founded on this: 'If ye be Abraham's seed, through Sarah, then are you heirs according to the promise.' But our claim is: 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abrahams seed.' This distinction may be easily discovered by one of Mr. C's disciples, I cannot see it. Because all the rights, immunities and privileges we possess in virtue of being fœderally represented by Abraham, in any covenant were all by Isaac. So says

the apostle Gal. 4. 28. 'Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.' In any future age after the death of Abraham, such Midianites Ishmaelites &c, his natural descendents, as believed, they received the blessings of Abraham, not from any natural relation to him, but by Isaac, the child of promise. Unfortunately for Mr. C.'s system, it is in the covenant of Circumcision, where we have the first special promise of the birth of Isaac, the son of promise.

But the title of the heathen world to the church, is, by the apostle Paul, declared not only to be by Isaac, promised in the covenant of circumcision but also conveyed to the heathen in the same way it was to him. Rom. 9. 7, 8. 'Neither because they are the seed of Abraham *are they* all children: but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called; that is, they who are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.' In the covenant made 25 years before this mentioned in the 17 chap of Gen. I grant a seed was promised, but from any thing said in the 12th chap. it was impossible for Abraham to have learned which of his sons was to be his heir; but the covenant of circumcision mentioned the *son*—his child by Sarah, the child of promise, by whom Jews and Gentiles obtained the possession of Abraham.

The seed of Abraham by Isaac, were the branches among whom the Gentile converts were grafted in, and both these enjoyed blessings by Abraham in the same way, I know not, if any of the natural or temporal blessings, possessed by Abraham, considered as an individual man, descended to his third generation, it was because Isaac was his son of promise, that he received more blessings for him-

self and his seed, than Ishmael did, and because he was the son of promise, that we, as the seed of Abraham, receive blessings by him.

Again hear his question, 'are they the same in re-
'lation to the nature and extent of the privileges
'secured to the respective subjects under each of
'these covenants?' From what has been said, the answer is easy. They received their privileges through the same external medium, from the same author by means virtually the same, from the same covenant, and as children of the same family. Mr. C. at his leisure can tell the difference and upon due thought he will find it nothing more, than that, which I have already shewn—the *peculiarities* of the dispensation.

Quest. 2nd. 'Are they the same in respect of the interesting or entitling condition?' &c.

If by the interesting or entiling condition Mr. C. means that which in law gives us the claim to the privileges of the covenant, I answer, it is the same in both covenants, faith in the obedience of our Lord, is the interesting claim; the obedience of this mediator, the alone fulfilment of the condition for either Jew or Gentile. The spirit of God by the apostle Paul has erected too strong a wall to inclose this doctrine, to be thrown down by Mr. C. Rom. 4. 16. 'Therefore it is by faith that *it might be* by grace; to the end, the promise might be sure to all the seed; not that only which is of the law, but that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.' Will Mr. C. make works the entitling condition of either new or Old testament saints. We will however attend to this in its proper place.

Q. 3rd. 'Is the condition of the continued en-
'joyment of the covenanted blessings, the same in

'in both covenants?' To this I answer, yes; because the fulfilment of the condition of this covenant, under any of the dispensations, secures the continuation of the blessings to the covenanted persons; God's oath secures it to the church in all ages. Psal. 89, 35 36. 'Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David, his seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me.'

3rd The change of dispensations that took place nearly eighteen hundred years ago, did not vary the *deeds* or other *land titles* with believers, in the land of Canaan. The rights of property were the same, when Christ left the world, that they were before it. This assertian is true, whether we speak of the claims of believers in relation to God, or man. Mr. C. would endeavour to persuade the reader, that such individual believers as Christ found on earth, received, by his coming, new titles to temporal property. These believers lived under both dispensations: when they lived under the former dispensation, all the rights they possessed to temporal property, were conditional, but no sooner did the dispensation change, than they found, that this condition for the continued possession of the blessings was also changed, of course, all the *titles* founded upon this change, had to be varied accordingly. I am certain that the perilous state of Jewish *titles*, as taught by Mr. C. never once occured to any lawyer in all Judea.*

* The reader will look attentively at Mr. C's query. 'Is the condition of the continued' &c. Is it just reasoning to contrast the temporal blessings of Old testament believers with the spiritual blessings of saints now? To reason fairly we must

3rd. The store house of free grace, was opened immediately after the fall, the public proclamation was to all to come and possess the blessings contained in it. The grant was unconditional, a right to the continued possession of the good things of this world, so long as was necessary, was found among the other treasures, and equally secured to believers. This was equally secured to Jew or Gentile converts without mentioning time, or refering to national distinction; Christ declares, 'Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.'

Were you to credit Mr. C. you would believe that the situation of people under the Old testament dispensation; differed but little from the state of man under the covenant of works, Adam in a state of innocency, had a right to eternal life, but there was a condition that lay between him, and the continued possession of the blessings of that covenant. That his situation was precarious was proved by the event *his fall*, but, according to

---

compare their temporal blessings with ours, as also their spiritural blessings, with those under the present dispensation. Continued possession of temporal blessings, I grant, had some conditions in every age of the world, life was uncertain, and this from a variety of causes, besides the want of food. But titles to these several blessings, distinct in their nature, were in any age of the world the same. The Jews had no more covenants or any more security for temperal blessing than we have, an American believer, has the 'continued possession' of his farm upon the same condition that a Jew had, or at least Mr. C. has not shewed the difference.

Mr. C. this was the precise situation of those who were under the covenant of circumcision. Page '79. 'The first depended upon an *if*, it was condi-'onal; they were to enjoy it so long as they were 'willing and obedient, consequently by their disobedience they were excluded.'

The word *if*, was no more expressive of a condition in the covenant, God made with the Jews, than it is under the present dispensation. The reader will compare the language used respecting the blessings of the new covenant, with those quoted by Mr. C. from the covenant of circumcision. Heb. 3. 6. 'But Christ, as a son over his own house, whose house are we, *if* we hold fast, the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope, firm unto the end.' John 31. 'Then said Jesus to those Jews who believed on him, *if* ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed.'* The word *if*, has in these passages, as much the force of a condition, as in any declaration made to Abraham or any of his children.

To be willing and obedient, is a summary duty enjoined in the present administration of grace, as really, and with all the authority it ever possessed, and I might add, that it is as really conditional as ever it was, since the fall. Mr C. mistakes the point, when he supposes that the 'new covenant,' has relaxed our obligation to duty. But the truth is, that the Divine Being never did require any conditional duty since the fall of man, even faith,

* Mr. C. with the assistance of Thomas Aquinas must in his next treatise shew the difference between the use of the word *if*, in these passages and the use of it, in the covenant made with the Jews.

which is a moral duty, is not conditionally required. It has the sanction of a Divine command.—'This is the command of God that ye believe on his Son.—'The true consequence of believing is also stated.' 'He that believes shall be saved.' Yet it is called the 'gift of God'—and is therefore a promised blessing; and would therefore be the condition of itself. 'If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land,' states the consequence of obedience—'it is eating the good of the land,' but obedience is no more the condition of their continued possession of that land, than it is of our continued possession of the blessings of ternal life, as is evident from the passages just quoted. But in Page 79.—'Mr. W. will be asshamed of his answer.' I shall now leave it with the reader to judge, who has the best right to be asshamed.*

Mr. C. says 'that the first covenant was enjoined in such a way, as it might be forfeited.' This indeed makes the covenant of circumcision, to all intents and purposes, a covenant of works. In the first covenant God made with man upon the condition of obedience, he promised eternal life—had he given this obedience, he would have been entitled to eternal life. But this is the language

*It is something remarkable that the system of grace the Baptists have adopted, is so contradictory in its very nature & being. By legal obedience, saints under the Old testament were saved—they are however, now saved by grace. Although Mr. C. has invented, in most things, a system entirely new—never heard of by the Prophets, or yet any of his brethren, in this, however, he has followed the Baptist writers generally.

of Mr. C. respecting the covenant of circumcision. This covenant of which Mr. C. is the inventor was, in its very *being* and organization, a covenant of works, and like it, had its eternal forfeiture. Thus after the covenant of works was made, and broken, another covenant was made upon a similar condition, without surety or indeed any security for the *continued possession* of its blessings but our corrupt will; Query, How was the state of the Jewish believers rendered any better by it? 2nd. Query, As every one of the Jews were unwilling and disobedient—they were sinful beings, why were they, not instantly chased from the land of Canaan, as our first Parents were from the 'Garden of Eden.'

It appears now that the Divine Being, according to Mr. C. made two covenants with Abraham as a public person; the first covenant, a covenant of grace, the second a covenant of works. The first secured all blessings, freely, the second conditionally, with disobedience they might enjoy the blessings of the former, but obedience was required as the entitling condition of the latter. By the first, Abraham and his posterity were made free, by the second they were bound. The simple statement of Mr. C's Doctrines in this place is their refutation. We shall now proceed to answer his remaining queries. P. 76. 85.

Query 4th. 'If both these covenants are the same, in what respect is the new said to be better than the old?'

Answer. In the dispensation alone, for reasons already given.

Query 5th. 'Are the duties enjoined upon the covenanters the same in both?'*

*What does Mr. C. mean by the 'duties enjoin-

Ans. Yes—with the difference of circumstance alone. To which I have also attended.

Query, 6th. 'Are the penalties threatened, the same in both?'

I answer there are no penalties appended to either covenants. He was exceedingly surprised when Mr. W. gave this answer; and this astonishment he expresses with much fervor P. 36.—and, here he intimates the consequence as it respects Mr. W's doom, before the bar of that church to which he belongs, but in this part of the discussion I rather think Mr. C. should save his fears and tremble before the bar of his own conscience. Because he is the first man of whom I have ever read, or heard, that declared that the covenant of grace, either as administered under the Old or New testament, possessed any penalty,† every branch of the true church holds

---

ed being the same in both.' The duties enjoined, upon any two individuals are not the same, much less can they be expected to be the same, under two different dispensations. Mr. C. was not bound to the same precise duties in single life that he is now—he was not then bound to love his wife and teach his children. Query, Is he now under the same law he was then? this possesses all the force of query 5th.

† I have supposed perhaps Mr. C. meant nothing more by the word *penalty*, than *chastisement*; this might in some measure appear consistent with his observations, upon what he calls the penalties of the New covenant; but it will not do when tried by his observations upon the Old covenant. This novel and erroneous expression must either rise from ignorance or corrupted understanding.

that Christ bore the penalty of the covenant of works, and this he agreed to do in the covenant of grace. Why then should his people in any age of the world, be subject to a penalty? The papists are the alone body on earth, called by the christian name, that on this point agree with Mr. C. They suppose that full satisfaction was not made to the law and justice of God by Christ Jesus—that therefore another place of punishment is necessary, to complete the penalty of the law. Protestants have always endeavoured to refute them, by establishing the fullness of Christ's satisfaction, and thereby proving that the doctrine of a purgotary, was not only absurd, but unnecessary. The Baptists have enlisted against Mr. C. on this point—Mr. C. would do well to read a work written by an eminent Baptist, Mr. Boothe, entitled *Glad tidings*. He will then be as much surprised at Mr. B. as at Mr. W. But if Mr. C. has no access to this work I shall submit the matter to an inspired writer Gal. 3, 13. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' For Mr. C's sake I wish he had read this passage before he had said so much against Mr W.

He says the penalties annexed to 'the old covenant were numerous and severe.' P. 86. I grant indeed that the penalty of the covenant of works, contains curses, numerous and severe; and that, during every revelation of the Gospel;

It can hardly rise from the former, because his library when carried to the stage in pomp, presented nearly a cart load of books, and as an indisputable proof of the good sense of those books he told the audience tby crossed the sea.

these curses were revealed as the just declarations of the Almighty, against the unbelieving and disobedient, against those who refused to become subjects to the law as a rule of life, and by faith receive the promises of the gospel. If a city of refuge was provided for New, or Old testament sinners and they refused to fly to it; it was but just, they should feel the potent arm of the avenger of blood. When Mr. C. is trying to preach, does he never inform his hearers, that 'he that believeth not shall be damned?' He considers himself a New testament member; will he find a penalty more severe under the Old testament? Does he never inform his hearers, that without the blessing of God, they are cursed in their basket and in their store? Moses intimates no more under the former dispensation. If Mr. C. asks a blessing to the food he eats, does he not pray to be delivered from the curses mentioned by Moses and other inspired writers?

But here lies the great defect, by which Mr. C. thinks to escape. He takes care to give us no meaning of the word *penalty*, had he done this the reader would have found him out. The distinction between a penalty of a law and fatherly chastisement is obvious. They are distinct, both in their administration and nature. The former is inflicted by a Judge, the latter by a Father. Penalty vindicates the justice and authority of a law —chastisement subdues corruption, the first condemns, the other sanctifies. The matter of sensible, or temporal punishment may be the same in both cases; but very different in their nature and end. Even the Gallows that to many is a mournful and disgraceful passage, to a still more dreadful place, may be, to some, a dark passage to a

blessed palace; the sufferings even of death, may be the same in both cases, yet the one is penalty, the other chastisement. The law demands, by its penalty, the death of a wicked man, but it does not even demand natural death from a believer; he dies by the merciful rod of a father, but not by any demand of Justice. It is to them a new covenant blessing. 'All is yours, whether Paul or Appollos, or Cephas, or life, or death.'

Mr. C. in order to establish his self created system, entertains you with an extraordinary comment on Gen. 17. 14. 'And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin, is not circumcised, that soul *shall be* cut off from his people, *he hath broken my covenant.*' 'The *cutting off* says Mr. C. 'from his people, was the penalty first proposed.' P. 87. Seldom has there been an individual raised in the church, too ignorant to know that the expression '*cutting off*' when used in scripture, means nothing more than separation from the church, by censure: to introduce prooff for the establishment of this, would be to impose on common sense. Even the Baptists have often inflicted Mr. C's penalty to its fullest extent. It is the end of all penalties, to inflict the punishment for crimes required by the law, and no further to consult the benefit of the culprit than is consistent with the dignity of the law, requiring such penalty. But the intention of all disciplinary punishment, is ultimately the salvation of the subject. 1. Cor. 5. 5. 'To deliver such an one unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'

But each of these covenants have penalties, according to Mr. C. 'The ultimate of all the pen-
' alties of the old covenant was, the final and eter-

'nal rejection of refractory subjects, from being 'the people of God, in any sense. But the ulti- 'mate of all the penalties of the new covenant, is, 'to make the subjects of it partakers of his holi- 'ness, and to exempt them from the condemnation 'of the world.' Page 88. The penalties of the first covenant, condemned forever, but the penalties of the new covenant, saved its subjects eternally. A new kind of penalties, for the invention of which, Mr. C. deserves the honor. In all the Bible, we have no such account of penalties, belonging to either of Mr. C's covenants. Let us hear the titles and description of Mr. C's penalties by an inspired writer—does he call them penalties or even hint that they were such? Heb. 12. 8. 'But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons.'

Reader, again turn back, and review Mr. C's doctrine, respecting these two covenants, with their penalties, conditions, &c. Saints, under the Old testament—Mr. C's old, 'musty covenant' were, by its laws, subject to the pains of eternal death, final rejection, &c. It was indeed discouraging to the saints of that time; why did any of them forsake their father's house—suffer persecution, wander in deserts, and after all, by the laws and true spirit of that covenant, might be eternally rejected? If his doctrine be true, there was still a much greater difference between the two covenants, than has ever occured to any of Mr. C's predecessors. It was nothing less than this, that saints, under the first dispensation of grace, were not only in a conditional state, and this condition was perfect obedience, but from any promise of this covenant, or any relation they held to God, might finally fall from a state of grace. Que-

ry: Does Mr. C· believe his own system?

'Query 7. Was not Abraham, by covenant, the 'father of a two-fold seed, a natural and a 'spiritual?'

Ans. No. He was the father of a natural seed, by nature, as any other man is the father of a posterity—and he was the father of a spiritual seed, by covenant. 'It was not the children of the flesh, but the children of the promise, that were reckoned for the seed.'

'Query 8th. Did not Abraham's spiritual seed, 'cousist first of Christ, and all that in him, inherit 'the faith of the father of the faithful, whether 'Jews or Gentiles, and of them only?'

Ans. Yes; for by covenant he had no other seed.

'Query 9th. Did not the covenant of circum- 'cision exclusively belong to the natural seed of 'Abraham, as such, and to them only, as specified 'in Gen. 17?'

Ans. No: and with me agrees the apostle Paul. Rom. 4. 12. 'And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised.' This last query proves his stock was exhausted, because this is the very matter in dispute. By Mr. C's definition of this covenant, Abraham's natural sons, circumcised by him, seven out of eight, were excluded—six sons by Keturah, and one by Hagar, and all their posterity forever.*

---

* On the first day of public dispute, Mr. C. plead with the activity and ingenuity of an attorney, to be delivered from these covenants, but having spent a studious night, he appeared to be quite recovered, and with these questions, written in his

Having now endeavoured to establish the proposition, and having attended to Mr. C's leading objections to the doctrine of the proposition, we shall now look a little at his appendix, on the same subject.

FIRST COVENANT.

The Covenant of works,

Is, I grant, a true covenant; and of course, does not belong to any of this spurious list. But even on this old covenant, Mr. C. must exercise his inventive mind; & while nearly 6000 years have elapsed, since this covenant was entered into, Mr. C's improvement has never occured to any. 'Upon the 'whole premises we must observe, that in this whole 'transaction, Adam was entirely passive. He 'stipulated nothing.' page 158. I do not say, in reply, that Adam did stipulate any thing. It is not necessary, in order that a true covenant may exist, that both parties should stipulate: but if one party propose and another accept, it is a true contract. But was Adam passive? I answer No: because to

---

hand, vociferated and bantered prodigiously, what he was now ready to do with Mr. W. on these covenants. Yet alas! nothing was made, and in a few hours the old covenant was again a place of torture for Mr. C. He got angry at it, and called it the 'old musty covenant.' But when he comes to write, he is still better prepared, but still does as little for the subject. After the debate, he invented four new covenants, for fear of being confined to two; his reply will probably contain a few more.

accept implies action. But Adam did accept the terms of that covenant, while indeed it is not expressly mentioned, it is not only fairly, but even in the very *being* of the covenant, implied. The nature of Adam was perfectly conformed to the Divine will: that, therefore, which was the will of God to demand, was the will of Adam to obey, and the promises made by God, he chose to receive. Moral conformity to the Divine will, and a disposition to submit to his Sovereignty in all things—were created with him. It follows that Adam did not withhold his consent, but was active in giving it to God. But Mr. C. will, as usual, be ready to cry out, where is your warrant. I answer he concedes the justice of my plan of infering, in the same covenant, 'the token or seal of this transaction was the tree of life.' Here I agree with him, but where has he found any express warrant for his doctrine? where is life promised in the covenat of works? or where is the tree of life called a *token* or *seal* of this covenant? why these are implied. This I grant; but I have evidence equally strong, for Adam's actively consenting to the terms of this covenant. Gen. 1. 26. 'And God said, let us make man in our own image after our likeness.' Mr. C. on this passage must admit one of two opinions; either that of Immanuel Swedenburger, which declares this to be a corporeal likeness, or say that it was a moral likeness. Again, Heb. 7, 29. 'This only have I found that God made man upright. When God gave the command. 'Thou shalt not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, was Adam in possession of this holy nature, passive, mute? No: this would have been disobedience, a detestable indifference. The very language of his nature was, I will not eat

of it. I would only observe that out of Mr. C's seven covenants, we have not one fully possessing the character of a covenant, and indeed, this was not in any sense a covenant, if Adam was passive.

Before I proceed to view his remaining six covenants, I would premise a few things.

In every covenant made with man in which God promises mercy, grace, or any other blessing, such promises must, in some form, be the revelation of the covenant of grace, and in every instance where the formal assent of the church is mentioned, it is to them a covenant of duty; as it is an acknowment of the covenant of grace. It is an agreement to receive the promises of this covenant, to profess its truth and obey its law.

A frequent revelation of this covenant became necessary from the peculiar circumstances, in which the church was placed; sometimes this was revealed by way of promise. It was thus revealed to Abraham, in the 12th chap. of Geneses, when he was first called out of Ur of the Chaldees. Sometimes it is made known by the revelation of its precepts; this was the manner of its revelation on Mt. Sinai. But every separate revelation of this covenant, was but partial. It is impossible to take any just view of it, but by uniting all these revelations together, we shall then see its truth, its promises, its law; in a word, the scriptures of truth, is this *will* or covenant, sealed by the death of Christ the testator. But when this comprehensive view is taken still it is very partial. I believe that the babe, who enters into eternal life, sees more of this covenant, than all saints on earth, our blessings in this world, are seen at best but through a glass darkly.

The first revelation of this covenant was made

to our first parents in the garden of Eden, in a short Gospel Sermon, by a blessed preacher of righteousness. Here Mr. C. should have commenced his second covenant. In this sermon we have a revelation of an agreement of our fœderal head, to fulfill the condition of that covenant, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness, by his suffering unto death. Gen. 3. 15. 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.' But in process of time, when ministers, began to oppose the moral law, which was written upon the heart of man, and to encourage loose professors in the violation of the sabbath, a doctrine taught by the Devil, and very agreeable to the human heart; they soon obtained followers, the whole human race was destroyed by a flood, with the exception of Noah and his family. For the encouragement of the new world, it became necessary to make a second revelation of this covenant; this is Mr. C's.

SECOND COVENANT. P. 159.

'It was all promises and no commands.' P. 160. It is true, that there were no particular commands specified; yet it is true that all the commands that God had ever revealed to man, were fairly implied and revealed in that covenant. It is essential to the nature of God to require duty from every person with whom he makes a covenant. It is evident from Mr. C's statement of this covenant, that he supposes this doctrine is contained in that revelation, (let it be spoken with

more reverence than Mr. C. teaches it,) that as moral evil produced the flood, the Divine being now made a covenant, in which the whole world to the end of time, might do as they pleased. To make us certain that this is his view, he states that this 'covenant could not be broken.' It was a covenant without a law, 'where no law is, there is no transgression.' Fallen man, could not be a party in this covenant, or yet could perfect men be a party in it, sin is the breach of a law, holiness is conformity to it; but where no law is, neither of these can exist. Reader, look further at Mr. C's view of this covenant; a covenant giving great temporal mercies, but in the receipt of these, no obedience is required. Enjoy all its blessings and do as you please, is his definition of this covenant.

He says that the rainbow was merely a memorial of this covenant. P. 16. Perhaps Mr. C. in this assertion, understands himself. Yet I think it is difficult for any other person to understand this expression. If, by the rainbow being only a memorial of this covenant, he means, that it is only to keep it in memory—then it is another of his *new* inventions. I never knew it to be denied by any, that ever heard of that covenant; that the rainbow was a token that God would never again destroy the world by another flood; at least this is the Divine mind on this subject, in opposition to Mr. C. Gen. 9. 13, 14, 15. 'I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant, between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you; and every living creature of all flesh, and the waters shall

no more become a flood, to destroy all flesh.' It follows, that the rainbow is a token that God will never destroy the world by another deluge; we therefore propose some amendments on Mr. C's view of this covenant.

1st. That it was a gracious act of God the Father 'Originating in him, and ordained by him alone.'

2nd. It respected the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, and gives intimation to the wicked, that one great reason of their preservation is, 'for the Elect's sake,' while it secures the continued existence of the animal creation for the use of man.

3rd. 'It was absolute and unconditional,' and yet might be broken.

4th. 'It was all promises,' and commands, 'the blessings promised were temporal' and spiritual, 'and commensurate with time' and eternity.

5th. 'The token of it was the rainbow,' which was not only a security, that the world should never again be destroyed by another flood; but also an emblematical declaration, that Christ the glorious rainbow of that covenant, of which this was but a revelation in part, would never suffer the overflowing vengeance of God, to destroy any true members of this covenant.

THIRD COVENANT.

We have already observed many things on this covenant. I think the true calculation is given in another place. His citations from scripture to prove this a distinct covenant, equally apply to his fifth covenant. Aware of this, he resorts to his

usual plan of composing such scripture as will answer his purpose; he cites Luke, 1. 72. 'To perform the mercy promised unto our Fathers, and to remember his holy covenant.' He found it would not do, to have the passage so stated, because the fact would then have appeared, that Zecharias was acknowledging the covenant of circumcision; called by Mr. C. a national covenant. He therefore strikes out the words *unto the fathers* and inserts the words *By the Father*—such a plan is indeed novel, in the christian world—and would, in any other writer, be intolerable, but with Mr. C. it is not unusual.*

FOURTH COVENANT,

Called the covenant of circumcision.

Because circumcision, was now enjoined, as a seal of the covenant of grace; on this covenant we have already spoken at length. Mr. C. gives you his new system on this covenant. P. 165. I shall present the reader with some amendments to his view of this covenant.

---

*When I read this passage in Mr. C. I instantly turned to the errata—but found no correction; I then doubted not, but we should have it corrected in his second edition—but was again disappointed: his followers, took it for scripture. Had he even attempted to prove, that the original words admitted of the corrections, then it might have passed along with some of his *dipping* amendments; but no—we must take it for scripture, just because Mr. C. says so.

1st. 'It was confined' to Christ's family 'alone' consisting of Jews and Gentiles. Circumcision was now revealed, as the seal of this covenant.

2nd. Spiritual 'connection with Abraham, was the ground of claim or interest in it,' which connection is obtained by union to Christ. 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed.'

3rd. That God the Son 'would stand in a particular relation to this family, reign over them as king, protect them by his providence,' and bless them by his glorious gospel and its ordinances.

4th 'It was unconditional. The enjoyment of all these blessings, depended upon,' the obedience of Christ alone, and although they should break this covenant by their sins, HE would 'visit their faults with rods, their sins with chastisement; but his loving kindnes HE would not take from them.'

5th. It was a covenant, the visible sign, or seal of which was in their flesh, as a sign of an everlasting covenant.

FIFTH COVENANT;

The covenant made with all Israel at Sinai.

The particular character of the revelation of the covenant of Grace was;

1st. That it was the accomplishment of the promise 'of the covenant of circumcision,' mentioned in the 17 chap. of Gen. and also of the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ by sacrifice, mentioned in the 15th of Genesis and also of the first revelation made of this same covenant, Genesis 12, when Abraham was first called out of Ur.

of the Chaldees. It was the visible accomplishment of a promise, made in each of these covenants. But most of all, the literal accomplishment of a prophecy, made by God to Abraham, of the sorrows of his seed, and their deliverance. 'And that nation, whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterwards shall they come out with great substance.' Gen. 15. 14.

2nd. Like every other revelation of this covenant, it was unconditional. This was evident from the manner in which it was prefaced. Ex. 20. 2: 'I am the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.' The people all publicly consenting to this covenant, made it very evidently a covenant of duty. Ex. 19. 8. 'All that the Lord hath spoken will we do.'*

3rd. This covenant, only in part, was written upon two tables of stone, called by the apostle Paul, Heb. 9. 4. 'The tables of the covenant; in which covenant we may safely include all the revelations made at Sinai, which comprehended the revelation of the judicial, ceremonial, and moral laws,

*Every time of the particular revelation of this covenant to the church, it became a covenant of duty.—The church could never engage in a covenant of duty, without a revelation of the covenant of Grace—because this is the proper foundation of a covenant of duty. The covenant of grace contains the privilege and duty of the church; a covenant of duty, is the engagement of the church, to receive these by faith, to make a public profession of the same, and to have a life, correspondent to the obligations: this is all Seceders mean by covenanting.

together with all the promises there mentioned.

4th, The laws of this covenant were numerous, and perhaps it was the fullest revelation, ever made of the covenant of grace, at any one time to the church. Christ's office as a priest, was systematically shewn in the Aaronic priesthood, and his kingly government, in the revelations of the particular laws by which the church was to be governed.

5th. The Sinai revelation of this covenant, contained both promises and commands, and these promises, like those formerly made, contained blessings, both temporal and spiritual, unconditionally given.*

6th. This covenant was read, as were all the former revelations of it, in the audience of all the Jewish church. To prove that this was the covenant of grace, the promises of which in due time, would be confirmed by the death of Christ, the testator, immediately after the revelation of it, sacrifice was offered, and after taking the blood of the sacrifice, this book containing the covenant was sprinkled, to intimate the bloody confirmation it should receive, the people was also sprinkled, to intimate that the same death, would be the atonement of their sins. This decleration was made. 'This is the blood of the covenant, which God hath enjoined unto you.' Heb. 9. 20, compared with Ex. 24. 8.

SIXTH COVENANT.

This covenant was a part of that revelation

*It was against that part of this covenant, which was written on tables of stone, that Mr. C. a few years ago wrote a phamphlet.

made at Mount Sinai, in which the eternal priesthood, of our Lord Jesus Christ was typically confined to Aaron and his sons in succession, until the coming of the antitype. This priesthood differed from the Melchisedec priesthood, in that it was confined solely to the family of Aaron. The continuation of this priesthood, depending upon the living successors of Aaron's sons, rendered it not only a changeable, but uncertain priesthood; in these respects it was far inferior to the priesthood of Melchisedec, for his priesthood, not depending either upon the standing of his predecessors or successors, was an unchangeable priesthood.

Owing, however to the bravery, and particular fidelity of Phineas, one of the sons of Aaron. This covenant was revealed in the strongest terms. Number. 25.12, 13. 'Wherefore say, behold, I give unto him my covenant of peace, and he shall have it, and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood.'

We shall mention a few things in a great measure, peculiar to this part of the revelation of the covenant of grace.

1st. That it was a soverign act of the Almighty, to appoint Christ to the office of Priest, or Aaron to be a Priest typically to represent him.

2nd. The divine appointment, confering the priesthood upon Aaron, is called the covenant of peace, because the sacrifices he was ordained to offer, represented the great High Priest, shedding his blood to obtain eternal peace.

3rd. This revelation of the covenant of grace, was like every other revelation of it, 'unconditional,' as it respected any thing to be performed by typical persons.

4th. The promises of this covenant were, by

God's word, confirmed to Aaron and his sons, that they should hold this typical priesthood, and confirmed to the church, that they should have an everlasting priesthood.

5th. It was called an everlasting priesthood, because it was to remain eternally with the church. 1st. Typically: 2nd. Really in Christ himself, who is called in Psal. 110, 'A priest forever' and because, 'HE ever liveth to make intercession.'

6th. In this official character of the priesthood, the laws regulating the particular duties of the office, were not seperate from, but essentially connected with the office of this typical priesthood.

7th. In the laws regulating the ordination, and duties of the High priest, we have an awful warning of the danger, of any person taking this office unto himself, such as independants—self called ministers &c. 'No man taketh this office unto himself, except he that is called, as was Aaron.'

SEVENTH COVENANT.

'*Of Royalty of David.*'

Of this covenant we have a full account in the 1st. and 2nd. books of Samuel. The book of Psal. &c. The peculiarities of this revelation of the covenant of grace are:

1st: That it was a sovereign act of God to appoint Christ his 'king in the holy hill of Zion' or David a king to typify him.

2nd. The temporal throne and sceptre were promised to David, as a representation of the throne and sceptre which eternally belonged to Christ.

3rd. This covenant might be broken by David, or any of his typical successors, but could not by the great antitype.

4th. It was all promises and commands. Its blessings were temporal and spiritual, there was promised a throne, a sceptre, a kingdom, all of which were to be typical, until the coming of the root, and offspring of David.

5th. There was no particular necessity for any separate seal to this revelation of the covenant of grace, seeing that circumcision, and the passover, were the seals of all the items contained in this covenant.

6th. This continues eternally. The sceptre was held by typical kings, until the coming of Christ; when he lifted the falling sceptre of David, never to return it to any typical king, but hold it himself and reign forever.*

We have now travelled through Mr. C's covenants, and had he taken a little more leisure, and read his Bible with more attention, he might have greatly increased the size of his book with covenants. His seven are but a brief specimen of his power of invention, hundreds might have been added upon the same principle, nay thousands; at least a distinct covenant for every period in the scriptures, because he evidently suppo-

* It is evident to the reader, that we have attempted to make some amendments on Mr. C's covenants, and we think have succeeded in reducing their number to two. We confined ourselves to his plan. We give him the honor of inventing at least 5 out of the 7. Mr. C. will pardon me, for prefering the scripture view of the subject to his.

ses that every distinct revelation, was a distinct covenant, how far he has succeeded I shall let readers judge for themselves.

It is also evident that he possesses equal ingenuity for creating conditions, that he does covenants, he makes every *if*, that he finds in the scriptures, a *condition*, but not having as great a supply of *if's* on hand, as he had of covenants, some of these had to come out *unconditional*.

From this proposition, as now established, we shall draw a few conclusions, we think now proved.

FIRST INFERENCE.

That variations in the external circumstances of a covenant never affect its being, as a contract, and that the only difference between the old and New testament covenants, was, in the *dispensation*; and therefore there was but one covenant, under both dispensations.

SECOND COVENANT.

That the relation between Abraham and the church, was only Spiritual, that in this sense alone, a seed was promised to him, and that with him, God made but one covenant, although he frequently renewed the same.

THIRD INFERENCE.

That the church is one, in all ages of the world, the covenant one, and the Lord one. Any righteous engagement of the church, is binding upon herself in any future period; the circumstances, or

any of the duties being the same, and that we mean no more when we say, that the covenant of our spiritual ancestors is binding upon posterity.

FOURTH INFERENCE.

That this covenant is not entailed by natural relation. That a savage under this dispensation embracing the christian religion by faith, is as true a child of Abraham, as Isaac was; and on the contrary a natural son of Abraham, was no more one of his children by covenant, if in a state of nature, than a savage who is yet in that state.*

III. PROPOSITION.

That circumcision was a sacramental seal of the covenant of grace, as administered under the Old testament, and, to the heirs of that dispensa-

*By those who oppose the binding obligations of covenants upon posterity, it is sometimes asked; how do we know that we are the natural posterity of those who covenanted? The question is answered above.—That it matters not whether we are the natural posterity, or not. A child adopted into a family, is as subject to the laws and as really entitled to the privileges of the family, as if he had been born in it. Heathens, are Abraham's family, the covenant secured them to him for a seed, although no natural relation existed. We are therefore bound to all the moral duties of the Abrahamic covenant, and by faith entitled to all its privileges. This note is not designed for Mr. C. Of this duty he does not appear to understand the least principle.

tion, it was a seal of all the Gospel promises, made to them by their Lord; and was therefore itself a gospel ordinance.

I define circumcision to be, a sacramental seal of the covenant of grace, as administered under the Old testament dispensation; wherein, by cutting off the foreskin, from, the male infant, or male adult; they were introduced into the church of Christ; and their being cut off from the law, as a covenant of works, and from the relation to the first Adam as their fœderal head; and all the effects of that relation through Christ, was thereby, signed; sealed and signified.

We shall now endeavour to establish our proposition by proving its different parts.—

1st. It was a seal of the covenant of Grace. That the covenant to which it was appended was the covenant of grace, we think is already shewn at length, but more is necessary on this point of the subject; we observe, first; That the apostle so explains it, Rom. 4. 11. 'And he received the sign of circumcision; a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had*, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also.'

2nd It is granted, that it was a seal of that covenant; God made with Abraham, mentioned in the 17. chapter of Genesis; called the covenant of circumcision; but the blessings there designated we have proved to belong to the covenant of Grace alone; therefore circumcision was a seal of the covenant of Grace.

3rd. The covenant of grace is the *testament*, of which Christ Jesus is the testator, and the church the alone heir, then if by circumcision they were

initiated into this body, and thereby constituted the visible heirs of this covenant, it follows that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of Grace, but the former is true, Gen. 17. 'And the uncircumcised man child whose, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people.' In this passage, the following doctrine is fairly included, that if the omision of this rite was a public declaration, that there was no relation subsisting between them and the church, then the receiving of it was a public profession of the union. The truth of this doctrine was felt by Moses in his return from the wilderness, to join his fellow professors, then in bondage in Egypt. Ex. 4. 24, 25. 'And it come to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him. Then Zepporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son and cast it at his feet, and said, surely a bloody husband art thou to me.'*

The conclusion is true that circumcision is a seal of the covenant of Grace.

---

*This is an awful warning to Parents who through carelessness or othewise, neglect the dedication of their children to God, in baptism—It fared with Moses as it sometimes does with good people, in bad company, they forget and even become neglectful of their duty, which nearly cost him. his life. His wife who had been some kind of Baptist, was enraged at this dedication of her child, like Mr. C.—She saw no necessity for it, like him, she could not see how it would make her son any better, she merely done it to save her husband's life. Had she lived at this time, she would have had many to have agreed with her.

Circumcision ceased in the manner of its administration, with that dispensation, because all the ordinances of Old testament, wore the same character: uniformity and consistency, is the character of all Divine ordinances—they must all be adopted to the dispensation under which they are administered. The change of dispensation will, therefore require a change of all the ordinances. This observation is equally true, both as it respects those rites, which were to be entirely abolished, and those which only underwent an external change. Sacrifices which had no other, than a typical existence, of course, ceased to be when the Great antitype was offered, but the office of the ministry, which in general had a miraculous appointment, under the New testament, exists by regular ordination.

It was ever necessary, that the covenant of Grace should have a seal; under the former administration of it, a seal suited to that time, was instituted: the same necessity of it continues, the seal is accordingly varied to suit the present dispensation of Grace.

That it was a Gospel ordinance, will appear by observing,

1st. That regeneration was one of the leading privileges emblematically set forth in this rite. Deut. 10. 16. 'Circumcise therefore the foreskin, of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked. Also chap. 30. 6. 'And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.' So also the New testament writers understood it. col. 2. 11. 'In whom also, ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the bo-

dy of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ.'

2nd. That this seal was confined to a holy seed. For while it was the privilege of his servants and also of all his children to receive the administration of this rite, yet with none of these was it to be continued as a divine ordinance, but with Isaac. The reason why the other members of his family were entitled to this privilege, was because they were raised according to, the laws of the covenant of Grace, possessed its privileges, and thereby became entitled to its seal; this is amply taught when God speaks of Abraham. Gen. 18. 19. 'For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham, that which he hath spoken.'*

*It appears that the Arabs the posterity of Abraham, by Ishmael, yet circumcise, with all the punctuality of the Jews, with this difference, that indeed of the eighth day, they perform it, on the eighth year. This unhappily for the Baptist, cuts off their position that circumcision was a national distinction, because it does not distinguish them from the Jews. Mr. Riley our fellow citizen, observes that the Arabs in the deserts circumcise to prevent disease. But however accurate he is in most of his observations, he is mistaken in this; because Doctor Parks found them observing the same rite in Affrica, among settled nations, who did not attend to it, it is also found that the Arabs circumcise in Asia and in Europe, where they live among christian nations, who pay no attention to circumcision.

I infer that it was to be confined to his posterity by Isaac in particular, not only from the fact as it afterwards appeared, but also from the covenant being confirmed with his seed by Isaac at the time circumcision was instituting. Gen. 17, 19. 'and God said Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him, for an everlasting covenant and with his seed after him. Why was this secured to Isaac? It was because he was a son; not of the flesh; but of promise.' They who are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.' Baptists grant that the covenant of circumcision did secure a seed; let them now submit to the divine difinition of that seed just quoted, and there can remain no dispute. They were to be a spiritual seed—the children of God.'

3rd. The very covenant of which circumcision is the acknowledged seal, secured the continuation and spread of the everlasting gospel, Gen. 19 7, 'and I will establish my covenant between thee and me, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee.' We find A similar declaration made from Mt. Sinai. 'I am the Lord your God.' So in the New testament we have it recorded of Thomas, that he expressed his faith appropriating this precise promise with others of the same import. "My Lord and my God." I would now ask the weakest believer, or even one of Mr. C's. followers would they desire a more comfortable gospel promise, than this mentioned in Gen. 17. I will be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee! The attempts of men weaken or

destroy Gospel promises should by all good people, be opposed, because they are the only support of a believer during the time he is a stranger and a pilgrim on this earth. Psal. 119. 45 50. 'Remember the word unto thy servant, upon which thou hast caused me to hope. This is my comfort in my affliction: for thy word hath quickened me.' Faith can only act upon promises according to their true interest. But if the promise made to Abraham respected *only* an earthly Canaan, then no saint dare apply it to spiritual purposes but the scripture affords as abundant examples of believers, having so applied it, it follows that the true *interest* of that promise was gospel blessings, presented to believers to the end of the world, and by them eternally enjoyed.

But I say also, that it secured the spread of the gospel amongst the nations of the earth, read v. 6: 'and I will make these exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.' By which, we cannot suppose, is to be understood, the royal children of Edom, Arabian kings, or the nations they governed, because Mr. C. tells us that this covenant, secured the land of Canaan for a perpetual possession. Page 165. Yet let the reader observe that Abraham's posterity by Jacob his grand son, was the only nation of Abraham's natural posterity, that inhabited the land of Canaan. Now although this might be the accomplishment of the promise as it respected kings, it cannot be so as it respected nations, the nation was but one. Mr. C's definition compells him to acknowledge that this promise made in the covenant of circimcision, could have no full accomplishment, until the nations of the earth were, by the spread of the gospel, born to Abraham; un-

til Kings should become the nursing fathers, and Queen's the nursing mothers of the church.'*

For my part I cannot see it to be a blessing, or yet can I see the necessity of a seal to a contract, which only secures a large, rude, and wicked posterity to any man. It is the possession of the gospel and its blessings, that truly exalteth a nation. It is no comfort to parents, surely, to have a numerous family; but to be a parent of a large and religious family is indeed a blessing—In this respect Abraham felt as other religious parents would. Was the doctrine of Mr. C. true, the covenant of circumcision could have afforded no comfort to a man so Godly as Abraham.

4th. I ask, why make a distinct covenant with Abraham, in order to put him in possession of a numerous family, and temporal blessings only? His family, should you take all his natural seed, were as much less than the family of Noah, as the part is less than the whole; yet the covenant God made with Noah, granted by Mr. C. and all the Baptists, secured to Abraham and his seed, all the temporal blessings of the covenant of circumcision. Was it impossible for Abraham or his seed, to plead any promise of that covenant? if not, by

* If Mr. C. should attempt to make this pitiful excuse, from this just conclusion, that although this promise was mentioned in the covenant of circumcision, it did not belong to it; I would reply that all the items of a covenant, are always made out, before it is subscribed and sealed. In like manner, after the promises of this covenant are mentioned by God, he appends the seal of circumcision, which, in every instance of contracts, is the security of the whole bond.

what were they excluded? or why make a separate covenant for that purpose?

5th. That this was a gospel ordinance appears from the acknowledged requisition of Mr. C. 'If ye be willing and obedient.' Although the reason, which made Mr. C. make this the entitling condition of the covenant of circumcision, more than to any other covenant, no one can tell; yet we shall shew that this concession forces him to yield the point. Christians will generally unite with me in declaring, that there is no obedience since the fall of man, without obeying this command: 'This is the command of God that ye believe on his son;' or will God ever accept obedience, performed by an unbeliever as such.

From the sentiments of Baptists respecting the Old testament dispensation, they may not concede this. Then let us, in order to try this obedience, use the language of the covenant of circumcision. 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed;' or the preface to the ten commandments. 'I am the Lord your God.' It will be conceded, that every act of obedience required by that covenant, demanded the acknowledgment of this first principle; all the obedience required, was to be performed to God, as their God. But the unbeliever could never render this kind of obedience, by any act, although the matter of the act is good, yet he rejects God. Can any one, therefore, believe Mr. C. who supposes that obedience may be required in any covenant of which God is one party, and fallen man the other, which obedience demands eternal destruction from the presence of God: for such is the character of the best works of the natural man.

But where is faith, the true principle of this obedience to be obtained? In no other place, than

in the gospel of peace. But Mr. C. concedes that the covenant of circumcision required such obedience as God would accept. Therefore, the covenant of circumcision, while its laws required obedience, its promises presented proper qualifications for rendering that obedience acceptable; but of these, circumcisions was the seal, therefore it was the seal of the promises of the everlasting gospel.

That circumcision was instituted by Christ to be a seal of the covenant of Grace, is the last thing in the proposition to be proved.

Without refering my readers to a vast pile of old Dictionaries, upon the meaning of the word *seal*, we shall just take the common acceptance of this word as used in scripture and in the common transactions of life, and define it to be a *sign affixed to a bond, contract, or covenant, as a confirmation of the things contained in the instrument.* Whatever this mark may be in civil life, each nation has the liberty of determining. In like manner, whatever mark or sign the head of the church may appoint, his subjects have a right to submit, whether it be a mark on the finger or any other member of the body,* or the application of water

* Mr. C. makes some very profane jests on this subject, which I think too rude to transcribe; any human institution, however wrong, will receive modest treatment from a polite writer; but how carefully should we speak, of an ordinance appointed by Christ Jesus king and head of the church: although, as Mr. C. supposes, the ordinance was civil and only secured temporal blessings, yet it is Divine, and merits all the reverence of any other ordinance.

eating of bread or drinking of wine, no matter, HE has liberty of choosing, we are bound to submit.

The dispute now is, was circumcision a sign or seal of the covenant of grace? I reply that I am certain it was, because the covenant to which it was appended, did contain spiritual blessings, the property of that covenant alone, and which I think I have proven at length, we shall only add one scripture passage upon the subject. Paul speaking of Abraham declares Rom. 4. 11: 'He received the sign of circumcison, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had, being yet uncircumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also.' This passage as it stands, plainly decides the controversy; because,

1st. It was a seal of the righteousness of faith to Abraham. Is this righteousness, a temporal blessing, a fruit that grows in the land of Canaan? Will Mr. C. answer in the affirmative? Is there any other righteousness than the righteousness of Christ, presented as the ground of acceptance with God? No Calvanist will reply in the affirmative. But the apostle in order to prevent any metiphysical misconstruction, designates the righteousness of which he speaks; it was that which the faith of Abraham received, and which alone could have been presented to him in the everlasting gospel. But this righteousness is the sum of all the blessings in the covenant of grace; no other blessing of that covenant could have been mentioned, that would have included as much. But of this righteousness the apostle declares circumcision was the seal.

2nd. That no ground of doubt, might be left, he intimates that the righteousness of which he speaks, upon which the faith of Abraham rested,

was the same that is now presented to believing heathens, read the passage again and you will find, that the righteousness sealed to Abraham was the same righteousness which is imputed to those who are uncircumcised. It follows by the most natural consequence, that circumcision was a seal of that righteousness which is now presented to us in the everlasting gospel, as the ground of our justification and acceptance with God.

3rd. Look at the historical facts to which the apostle evidently alludes. Abraham had first received the promise, as Mr. C. grants, mentioned in Gen. 12, afterwards he had the same confirmed by sacrifice chap. 15. But in the 17th. chap. he received a more full revelation of the blessings of the same covenant. All this revelation was made prior to the affixing of any permanant seal. Among other revelations made before this institution, this was one, that God would multiply his seed. The apostle therefore argues, that the heathens, who, with the Jews, are his seed, were included in that covenant; now of all these promises circumcision was given as a seal. I am persuaded that such is the evidence of this passage that no honest mind can prevent the conviction, that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace.

This view of the passage startles Mr. C. and. afraid of its mortal consequences upon his system; he thinks it best to deny the very *being* of seals under any dispensation, even baptism, and the Lord's supper.—P. 175. This is indeed, a universal disposal of the doctrine to which in a little we shall attend. But first of all, he attacks the sentiments of the apostle. Rom. 4 11. P. 17, 18. 'I know of no passage, more evidently a-

'gainst my opponent; for it goes to show, that cir-
'cumcision was to Abraham, what it never was,
'nor could be to any of his posterity. Will
'my opponent say, that circumcision was to Ish-
'mael, to Isaac, or to any of the infant offspring of
'Abraham, what it was to him? Was it a sign
'and seal to Isaac, or Ishmael of a righteousness
'which they previously possesed.' Now reader, you will observe some *new doctrine.*—It is, that the same ordinance, precisely the same, must have different meanings, when applied to different persons. A seal affixed to the same contract, by the same Lord, proposing the same end; yet it has a different meaning, when applied to different subjects. Mr. C.—you will again look your dictionaries for the word *seal.*

What did circumcision seal to Abraham, distinct from that which it sealed to other subjects? Mr. C. replies, 'had Ishmael or Isaac a righteousness which they previously possessed.' I answer,

1st. In order righteously to administer a seal of the covenant of Grace, it is not necessary that the person to whom it is administered, be in a known state of grace; otherwise Judas, or Simon Magus could not have been warrantably baptised.

2nd. There is a difference between making a righteous profession, and possessing the righteousness professed. The administration of the sacrament of circumcision to Ishmael or Isaac, was a legal ground, why they should be accounted holy, or righteous; but this did not make them personally so. In virtue of the promise made to Abraham, they were accounted a holy seed. 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed:' But circumcision was a seal of that visible relation; as really to the seed of Abraham, as to himself, for without

any change of expression, or variation of sentiment, HE is said to be both the God of Abraham and of his seed. I know of no blessing promised to Abraham, which was not also promised to his seed. In all those blessings promised to Abraham in Gen. 17. Abraham and his seed, stood on the same covenant footing, and therefore the same seal was equally applied to both.

Either Ishmael or Isaac, were as fit subjects of the righteousness possessed by Abraham as he was himself. Any infant by the special grace of God, may be regenerated and Justified, and thereby, may be made a partaker of that righteousness, which believers, by faith, claim. Mr. C. must either agree to this, or believe that all infants are condemned, for without this righteousness, neither infant, nor adult, shall ever see heaven.

Neither activity nor consent is essentially necessary to the imputation of Christ's righteousness: because regeneration and justification are the acts of another; the subject is passive; on which more afterwards. What I have said is sufficient to establish the assertion, that the righteousness of which the apostle spoke was the same to both Abraham and his seed. I do not say, all the generations of his seed: but all his seed by promise, Ishmael, Isaac, his sons, and all his servants were to him promised blessings, were to be raised under his particular inspection, and were therefore, fit subjects of this sacramental seal. But in 'Isaac shall thy seed be called,' and therefore such of his posterity alone, as were included in the covenant of circumcision were in their generations the fit subjects of this rite. Hence it was that the Edomites and Ishmaelites, stood in no

other covenant relation to Abraham, than the Canaanites or Moabites.

The revelation of this circumstance, that Abraham possessed this righteousness before he was circumcised, which Mr. C. takes as the ground of his assertion, afford no justification to his opinion. Would Mr. C. say, that all the Israelites born in the wilderness, during the forty years of their travel, were unbelievers? I think none will say so. But I observe that every one of them converted during their journey, Abraham-like, possessed this righteousness before circumcision; it was not until they come into the land of Canaan, any of them were circumcised, that were born in the wilderness. Joshua 5. 5. 'Now all the people that come out were circumcised, but all the people that were born in the wilderness by the way as they come forth, them they had not circumcised.' Yet Mr. C. asserts that circumcision was to Abraham, what it never was to any of his posterity. But all his posterity, who were justified before they were circumcised, had the blessings of that covenant sealed to them, precisely as Abraham had; but the states of persons are the same, and the righteousness the same, whether it be subsequent or antecedent to circumcision. A person who by faith was a partaker of this righteousness, before he was circumcised, enjoyed it in the same sense, he did, who was not made partaker of it until he was circumcised. This circumstance with respect to the time of being justified, is the alone ground of Mr. C's assertion: yet I think the intelligent reader will say, that it matters not when Justification takes place; that the righteousness to Abraham and his seed was the same, although the one was justified antecedent to cir-

cumcision, and the other subsequent to it.

But Mr. W's reasoning on this subject (says Mr. C.) 'is a sophism of the first magnitude; because 'it is drawing a general conclusion from a particular premise.' I reply, that my conclusion is no more general than my premise; because Abraham engaged to the duties of this covenant, as the church, or as the father of the faithful. Therefore that which may be predicated of Abraham sustaining this character, may also be predicated of all his represented seed.

Indeed, if the premise of my argument had been particular, it would have cut off, the chief source of all the comfort of the church ever since; for if the promise, or blessings of the covenant, had been particuliarly to Abraham, as Mr. C. supposes; then none of his spiritual seed, could ever have appropriated these promises or claimed these blessings; no individual could warrantably claim a promise, never addressed to him. Reader, view the difference between the faith of Abraham's seed, and Mr. C's opinion. Ex. 32. 13. 'Remember Abraham, Isaac and Israel, to whom thou swearest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land, I have spoken of, will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it forever.' But if Abraham, exclusively had been made a possessor of any of the blessings of that covenant, how was it possible for the Jews four hundred and thirty years after that time, to claim the blessings made to him. But common sense will say, that every part of a testament, covenant, or contract to which a seal is affixed, that all their items are equally sealed. But the apostle in the 4th. of Rom. only mentions one of these items, viz.

the righteousness which Abraham had by faith, which was sealed to him in his circumcision; this was, therefore, with the other blessings of that covenant sealed to him, and by the reasoning before, was also sealed to his posterity. Moses in the passage cited selects one item of the contract:—Paul cites another; each of their subjects required separate parts of the same covenant. It is only necessary that the apostle should speak of the time when Abraham was made partaker of righteousness. But it was necessary for Moses, to call up another part of the same covenant, and to claim its accomplishment to all the congregation of Israel, for whom he plead. Now I ask, by what authority, does Mr. C. declare that one item of this covenant was private, which the apostle tells us was sealed to Abraham by circumcision? when Moses who selects another stipulation of the same covenant, declares it to be public, and equally to belong to the whole company of the Jews. Now reader, whether of these two will you believe, Moses the inspired penman, or Mr. C.*

*Mr. C. in order to make a little sport, and call the attention of the reader, from Mr. W's mode of argument, page 19, creates a syllogism, in which he gives an example of Mr. W's mode of argument, from a particular premise, to a general conclusion; but he might have saved the reader some trouble, either by refering to some of his best arguments, for examples of false reasoning, or else in opposition to the apostle Paul, proved that Abraham was not the Father of the faithful, for without this last he cannot prove that Mr. W's. premise was particular.

It is indeed surprising to witness the efforts made by the Baptists, to destroy the true scripture intent of the rite of circumcision. Mr. C's predecessors, attempted to make it only a national distinction. Pedo-Baptists have succeeded in chasing them from this refuge. Mr. C. took no shelter under the covert of this argument. It appears indeed ridiculous to the christian, or even rational world, to hold that up for a rational distinction, which did not distinguish: It was found that circumcision did not distinguish between the Ishmalites and Israelites.

Mr. C. in order to hold up some substitute, and fill up the chasm made by the loss of this potent argument, invents a new one; or at least an old argument new modelled; that is, circumcision was indeed a seal of the covenant of circumcision, but that covenant only secured temporal blessings, such as a large family to Abraham, and a place for their habitation, the land of Canaan. &c. Let us try for a moment his arguments, and see their conclusions.

FIRST ARGUMENT.

Circumcision sealed the land of Canaan to all the specified subjects of the covenant of circumcision:

But the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh were the specified subjects of the covenant of circumcision;

Therefore, the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh, obtained a possession in the land of Canaan.

The conclusion of this syllogism is false—for these tribes never got any possession in the land

of Canaan; they possessed the kingdoms of Og and Sihon on this side Jordan. Mr. C's conclusion is false, because the scripture is true. What turn will he take next? Why! they got the land they desired—true, but the force of the argument depends upon their getting the land of Canaan. Esau or his children the Edomites, got the land they desired viz. Mount Seir. They too, were the children of Abraham, and had also the seal of this covenant in Mr. C's. sense. Let us therefore correct the argument, and make it correspond with truth.

Circumcision sealed temporal blessings to all the specified subjects of the covenant of circumcision:

But the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, were the specified subjects of the covenant of circumcision.

Therefore, the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, had an earthly possession secured to them, with other temporal blessings.

The defect in the first syllogism is, that the first term is false—the conclusion fairly founded on it is contrary to fact; but the last argument, in all its terms, corresponds with fact.

'If ye be willing and obedient,' is Mr. C's condition of this covenant. Perhaps he will say that these tribes were not willing or obedient. In doing this, he will again have to create some scripture, to prove that they were more disobedient and unwilling than any of those tribes that did inherit the land of Canaan.

SECOND ARGUMENT.

Circumcision, as the seal of the covenant of circumcision, only secured temporal blessings to its specified subjects.

But circumcision as a seal of the covenant of circumcision, secured the righteousness of Christ to Abraham, a specified subject of that covenant, Rom. 4. 11.*

Therefore, the righteousness of Christ, is only a temporal blessing.

Although it be unjust to reason from a particular premise to a general conclusion, yet every Logician will say that it is fair to reason from a general premise, to a particular conclusion. If I make a general assertion, therefore, respecting the covenant of circumcision, that must be true, of every particular contained in that covenant.

The assertion of the premise, is often made by Mr. C. 'It contained nothing but temporal blessings.' How can he rid himself of the conclusion? because every person knows it to be false. Now reader, view his method of escape; circumcision sealed to Abraham, what it did to no other specified subject. Then let us amend the syllogism to

---

*I wonder Mr. C. did not propose some amendment on the translation of this verse, or amend it, as he did the verse in Luke 1. It certainly stands much in his road, his most convenient method, will be, to borrow the plan of managing scripture from the Anti-trinitarians, on 1 John, 5, 7, and a few other passages, and urge the fact that, the Pedo-Baptists have put that passage in Rom.

suit Mr. C's exception, and see if it can answer his purpose.

If the blessings sealed in the covenant of circumcision were only temporal in their nature, then circumcision could not seal the righteousness of Christ to any of its specified subjects. But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

This argument would exactly serve his purpose, but it has this defect, that it has no scripture to support it; but an abundance of passages to contradict it; particularly that cited from Rom. 4. 11.

Let us therefore, once more correct it, by the word of God, and it will answer the purpose of every honest man.

The covenant of circumcision secured blessings, temporal and spiritual, to all its specified subjects.

But all believers represented by Abraham, were the specified subjects of that covenant.

Therefore all believers respresented by Abraham, have blessing, temporal and spiritual, secured to them, by the covenant of circumcision. Each of the terms of this syllogism corresponds with scripture and with the fact.

The first term is true, Gen. 17. 7: 'and I will establish my covenant between me and thee' &c. Rom. 4. 11. 'And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had, yet, being uncircumcised.'

The second term is true Gen. 17. 6: 'and I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.' Rom. 4. 11. 'That he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised. Rom. 9. 8. 'They who are the children of

the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise, are counted for the seed.' The conclusion will not be denied.

Upon the whole I observe, that it is impossible to foresee the point, to which the votary of absurdity, will travel. Mr. C. will no doubt find some method of cure, although I cannot tell what it will be: and, no doubt, it will satisfy his deluded followers, yet I think it improbable, he will satisfy himself.

IV. PROPOSITION.

That Baptism came in the room of circumcision.

It is evident from the observations made on the preceding proposition, that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace, as the same was dispensed under the Old testament dispensation. It was the first seal to be administered, to the subject of that dispensation, as a security, for their obtaining the blessings contained in the covenant of grace. That there were many to whom the seal was warrantably applied, who never were made partakers of its blessings, is granted. So there are many who subscribe with the hand, and affix their seal to obligations, who never discharge the duties required in the bond. All will therefore grant, that insincerity, or hypocrisy in receiving, or improving the ordinances of the gospel, never destroys their *being*, or varies their nature. Suffice it, to say, that all, to whom these seals are sanctified, possess a full security, to the blessings contained in the covenant of grace.

We shall now proceed, to prove the doctrine contained in the proposition.

If circumcision was a sacramental seal of admission, into the visible church, then Baptism came in the room of circumcision: but the former we have already proven: the latter follows, by natural inference. Baptists, aware of the conclusion, have taken care, never to grant the first assertion. They will admit that circumcision was any thing, but a seal of the covenant of grace. Mr. C. who excells all his predecessors, has with a newly invented tellescope, discovered five new covenants, out of which he has discovered that only one of them belonged to the covenant of grace; the rest were scarcely its satelites. Circumcision was a seal of one of the smaller covenants, but, according to him, was not a seal of the covenant of grace.

When we say, that Baptism came in the room of circumcision, we mean no more, than that baptism occupied the same place in the order of its administration, and the blessings it sealed, that circumcision did; and as circumcision was first in order, so is baptism. That it is sinful for an unbaptised person to partake of the Lords supper, is granted; baptism must precede. But with respect to the sacrament of the passover, the observation is equally true. Ex. 12. 48. 'And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover unto the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.'

But the spiritual import of the ordinances, establishes the truth of my proposition. Persons to be publickly acknowledged Christ's disciples, must be cleansed by the 'washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.' Tit. 3. 5.

Which is emblematically set forth in the rite of baptism. In like manner regeneration, or circumcision of the heart, was required of all those, who were under the former dispensation, constituted members. Ezek. 44. 9. 'Thus saith the Lord God, no stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel.'

As we approach nigher to the point of dispute, for fear of the consequences arising from principles established, Mr. C. while he reasons no better, declaims more heavily. By serious reasoning, by prophane sport, and by consequences without premises, he attempts to bear off the prize to the Baptists. There are seven points of difference, between these ordinances, that render our propositions entirely absurd—yet reader, let us seriously examine these, and you will find they shall at last appear like his six new covenants, only one, we have these detailed at length, pages 12, 13.

'Babtism differs from circumcision, first in the 'sex of its subjects, men and women were bap-'tised, males only were circumcised.' After the full reply made to this objection by Mr. Edwards and other Pedo-Baptist writers, we thought the objection would rise no more. We shall however give it all the force to which it *is* entitled. I would then observe:

1st. The dispute in this place, is not the number, or quality of the subjects of this ordinance. But we now dispute respecting the nature of the ordinances, as seals of a covenant. But it is self evident, that the difference, or agreement could never be learned from the number of the subjects to which either was applied.

2nd. The whole force of the objection consists in the limitation allowed by the head of the church, in the number of the specified subjects of circumcision. But if HE chose at any future period, to extend that limitation, will any person hence infer, that the very nature of the ordinance is thereby changed?

3rd. If, in any period of the church, women were excluded, by the divine command, from affixing one of the seals to the covenant of grace, and afterwards, by the same Lord, this privilege was extended to them, who is prepared to say with Mr. C. that, therefore, the seals were not the same in their nature and intent?

4th. It produces no change, either in a bond, or its seals, if in addition to its few original signers, some more should afterwards choose to come under its obligations, and enjoy its privileges by subscribing their names, and affixing their seals.*

*It appears from a note in Mr. C's. book P. 24, 25. that he had become something entangled with this observation of Mr. W. and that in an interval of the debate, he had taken legal council on the argument. Whether he had obtained the council by the payment of a fee, or obtained it gratis, he does not say. Yet I would inform the lawyer and his client Mr. C. that they are both wrong. 'He (viz. the lawyer) observed, that Mr. 'W's. argument from a bond was predicated upon 'a gross mistake of the true nature of a bond.' He adds, 'If there were a thousand names, or only 'one, added to a bond, it would avail those names 'nothing, unless there were some specifications, 'in the bond concerning them.' The latter assertion of the lawyer may be admitted, but it proved

Women were never excluded, in consequence of the difference of sex, from enjoying the benefits of this covenant; they were only excluded from affixing a visible seal, they are now admitted; not by changing the seal, but by extending the privilege.

I think these reasons conclusive. Had Mr. C. been serious, he would not have diverted the mind of the reader, by calling his attention to the different privileges of the subjects of the covenant of grace, in order thereby either to prove that there were different covenants or seals. The dispensation, under which, it is our privilege to live, knows no difference between Jew, or Greek;

---

nothing absurd in Mr. W's assertion. It will appear from the following examples. England and America made a national covenant sixty years ago; to this covenant there is an addition of millions, on each side, by birth, emigration &c. query is there any alteration in the bond? Though every individual is bound in the same sense, they would be, if their names were subscribed, and their seals affixed. Again: A father made a will: eight months after he died, his wife was delivered of another heir to the estate, query, would not this child, be bound by the obligation of the father's will, or covenant, and entitled to the privileges of it?

So precisely is it with the bond of which I spoke, the number of its heirs, vary in every separate age. Yet the covenant itself continues the same, and its seals the same. The reader who may neither be preacher nor lawyer, may come to a knowledge of Mr. W's. assertion without the cost or trouble of Mr. C.

bond, or free; male, or female. In all these respects the former dispensation did distinguish, the special exercise of grace, under that dispensation, was confined chiefly to the Jews. Should I now reason from this fact, as Mr. C. does, he would refuse my conclusion, for the same reason I refuse his. Reader, look at the force of his argument; just by changing the subjects, I shall, upon his plan, prove that *saving grace* in the hearts of believers, is now different, from that *saving grace* which existed in the hearts of believers, under the Old testament.

If saving grace, under the Old testament, was chiefly confined to the Jewish nation,

Then saving grace is not of the same nature, under the present dispensation, it was, under the former.

But the former is true; and therefore the latter.

Mr. Campbell's Argument.

If circumcision under the Old testament was confined to the male posterity of Abraham,

Then Baptism, the present seal of the covenant of grace, is not of the same nature of circumcision, a seal under the former dispensation.

But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

Every reason Mr. C. can offer, to prove the truth of the last syllogism, will bear with equal force upon the separate terms of the first—but the first is known by every person to be false, and as the second is established in the same manner, it must of necessity be also false.

The truth of my observations, is unanswerably confirmed by the apostle, in the passage last cited. Formerly, the privilege of a Jew, above a Greek,

was much greater; now, in Christ, they are equal. In the same manner, the privilege of a free man excelled that of a bondman: now they are the same. So that dispensation of grace distinguished between male and female, this is no more. But the addition of Greek converts to the church, Christ found on earth, varied not the nature of that grace that subdued both. In like manner, the addition of women, by the administration of baptism, the first seal of the covenant of grace, did not vary the nature of that seal.

'Secondly, it differs from circumcision in the 'age of its subjects. Baptism has no age speci-'fied for any of its subjects,' P. 12. I now agree with Mr. C. that, baptism has no age specified for any of its subjects.' From the birth to the grave, this ordinance may be administered. It is equally true that the male children of the Jews were ordered by the divine law, to be circumcised on the eighth day. Yet the reasoning of Mr. C. from this fact, is a sophism of the same nature, with the preceding difference, to which we have replied, because:

1st. The difference stated, depends not on the nature, either of circumcision or baptism, but only on the time of administration, the difference consists therefore in something without the ordinance, a mere circumstance attending it.

2nd. To circumcise on the eighth day, was not essential to the being of the ordinance, because we find that there was no circumcision during the travel of Israel in the wilderness—Joshua, 5. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. The divine law never did attach that importance to the eighth day, Mr. C's. argument does. The law did positively require the performance of the rite of circumcision; but it did not

as positively require the performance of it on the eighth day, as Mr. C. supposes. God declared that he would cut off the uncircumcised man from his people; but gives no hint that he would cut off those not circumcised on the eighth day; for had this been the statute, then all the males born in the wilderness, must have been cut off. It is evident therefore that the the whole force of Mr. C's. argument, depends upon a circumstance accompanying this ordinance, which was not essential to its *being*.

But suppose the statute had been, that all the males should be circumcised when infants, then Mr. C. would have asserted, as he did in the debate, that *child*, *infant &c.* meant people of thirty years of age; persons arrived to the years of maturity. This he proved from some old books, but not from scriptures. Pedo-Baptist's have the advantage in this place, the time when, this sacrament might be administered, was specified—it was on the eighth day. The reason, no doubt, of this positive injunction,—the particular specification of the time, was to prevent undue delay: had no time been specified, under one pretext or other, the *rite* would have been neglected, and in many cases, entirely omitted: some would have cavilled, perhaps like Mr. C. and shewn by strong arguments, that *infant* or *child* meant people of thirty years of age; to prevent this, the time was specified.

But the only argument, that should be drawn from this circumstance, by baptist or Pedo-Baptist, is, that under the former dispensation, persons were admitted members of the visible church when infants. Now reader look at Mr. C's. difference in its true dress.

If circumcision was performed on the eighth day,

Then baptism could not come in the room of circumcision:

But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

We refuse to admit the conclusion, from the importance attached by the argument to the eighth day: let us therefore amend the argument, by the facts as established by scripture.

If circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of Christ, was administered to persons in a state of infancy,

Then baptism may also be administered to persons of that age.

But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

The truth of this argument will appear from the following summary observations:

1st. It was not essential to the *being* of circumcision, that it be administered on the eighth day, from that day, to the seventy-fifth year, we have it performed by divine command.

2nd. Baptism may be performed on the eighth, tenth, or on any day.

3rd. From a collection of scripture facts, no more importance is essentially attached to the time of circumcision, than is to the time of baptism.

4th. Difference. 'Baptism differs from circum-
'cision, in the prerequisites required to a partici-
'pation of the ordinance, circumcision required
'only carnal descent from Abraham, or covenant
'relation to Abraham, but baptism requires no car-
'nal relation to Abraham, it requires simply faith
'in Christ, as its sole prerequisite. If thou be-
'lievest with all thine heart, thou mayest No
'faith, was required as a *sine qua non*, to circumci-

'sion. But the New testament requires faith, as a '*sine qua non*, to baptism.' Acts 8. 37.

I have not generally, blamed Mr. C. for ingenuity of argument. I have considered his sophisms, rather naked and exposed. This last difference is one of this kind. He is contrasting two ordinances, in order to find the difference between them, to be of that nature, and magnitude, that they cannot be of the same import; and therefore that the one cannot come in the room of the other. But in the contrast here made, he should either have left out 'Covenant relation to Abraham' when speaking of circumcision, or else continued it, when speaking of baptism; for otherwise the contrast was not fair. But neither of these he dare do. If he had omitted it altogether, the most ignorant person, that could read the scriptures, would have asked him for a warrant to circumcise Jewish prosylites, that had no carnal relation to Abraham. He dare not have omitted it in the subject of baptism; for then he must have turned Pedo-Baptist, and lost his aim: because, a covenant relation to Abraham, is the reason mentioned by the apostle Peter, why the children of his hearers were entitled to baptism. Acts. 2. 38, 39. 'Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit; for the promise is unto you and your children.' Should you ask, to whom was this promise made? It is answered to Abraham; and through him, to his spiritual seed. So reasons the apostle Paul. 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise.' The strength of Mr. C's argument depends upon the difference of the prerequisites:

1st. Carnal descent from Abraham. This however, will not answer his purpose; because it is not a fact. Carnal descent was not essentially necessary, in order to entitle to circumcision. Were Abraham's servants, born in his house, or bought with his money, or those heathens who became the prosolytes of the Jewish religion, Abraham's by carnal descent? They were to be circumcised, and yet they did not possess Mr. C's prerequisite.

When a scriptural view is taken of this subject, Mr. C's prerequisite disappears. For a long period, the gospel was in a great measure. confined to the natural posterity of Abraham. The promise was addressed to them, and not to the other nations of the world. This continued through the former dispensation. So the apostle declares, Rom. 9. 4. 'Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' But it is absurd to say that gospel ordinances should extend beyond gospel promise; this would be, to give ordinances to those who had no warrant to receive them. But, as the promises for that time, were chiefly confined to that people, so must the ordinances also. Circumcision, precisely like baptism, must extend only to its proper subjects; it belonged to the promise to point these out. The law, under both dispensations, required the administration of the ordinances; but it belonged to the promises to point out the proper subjects; a few observations will discover the true merit of Mr. C's distinguishing prerequisite.

It was but a small share of Abraham's natural seed. who were to be circumcised. This rite he was bound, to perform on his servants and

on his children; but there is no hint given, that this was to be continued to their posterity. Balaam was, I suppose, as truly a son of Abraham, as Moses was. Will Mr. C. say, that he was under the same obligation to be circumcised? He was a Midianite, a son of Abraham by Keturah. Or were all the hosts of wandering Arabs, that traverse the wide deserts, under the same obligation to receive this rite, the Jews were? Yet all these possessed Mr. C's prerequisites; carnal descent.

This, reader, is the reason he uses the words 'covenant relation;' because he found something else necessary, than merely carnal descent. This latter clause, he should retain and remove the former; or agree that all the worshipping assemblies that met at Jerusalem, from any thing in the covenant of circumcision, assembled in no other character, than an Arabian Caravan; for they all possessed Mr. C's prerequisite. The *covenant relation* makes the difference, I grant. The one was a people in covenant with God; the other was not. For this I contend, so does Mr. C. in this *difference;* yet, in other places denies it.

2nd. 'But baptism requires no carnal relation to 'Abraham; it requires simply faith in Christ, as its sole prerequisite. 'If thou believest with all 'thine heart thou mayest:' no faith was required 'as a *sine qua non* to circumcision. But the New 'testament presents faith, as a *sine qua non* to 'Baptism.' Acts. 8 37.

To faith, as a *conditio sine qua non* of baptism, we shall attend in its proper place. But what I shall endeavour to establish in this place, is, that it is no more a prerequisite of Baptism, than it was of circumcision.

I observe that it will be granted on all sides,

that the Jews were under the same moral obligation to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, that the church, under the present dispensation is. 'The just shall live by faith,' was as characteristic of the Old, as of the New testament saints. It was as truly the ground of their justification, as it is of ours. That it was as necessary, that faith should precede their receipt of ordinances, as it is, that it should precede ours, should not, by any professor of the christian religion, be denied.

A Jewish prosolyte testified his assent to the gospel, by his submitting to the rite of circumcision, in the same manner as a heathen would now, by his receiving the ordinance of baptism. Members of both dispensations were equally bound to believe; because, without faith it was ever impossible to please God. By what authority then, does Mr C. require it as a prerequisite to baptism and not to circumcision. That an adult should believe before he is baptized, I grant. But that faith preceded the circumcision of Abraham, is proved in the epistle to the Rom. I would further ask, was not a Jewish prosolyte bound to believe before he was circumcised? Mr. C. will grant this in some sense. He was bound to believe the promises of God, made in the covenant of circumcision, respecting temporal blessings; because circumcision sealed these. No matter, this faith was as really a prerequisite to his admission to the ordinance of circumcision, as saving faith is, in order to our admission to the sacrament of baptism: and children, being circumcised, when eight days old, would form no excuse to the prosolyte, for being without faith. Would it have been a duty for one of these converts to the Jewish religion, in the way of discrediting God's promises, respecting the

earthly Canaan, to have submitted to the rite of circumcision? Would not such conduct have been consummate hypocrisy? Mr. C. therefore, makes no escape by this distinguishing prerequisite.

It teaches a new doctrine, that a person may warrantably, have a faith in the promises of God, respecting temporal blessings, and yet possess no faith in the promises respecting spiritual blessings; and that the former is accepted of God without the latter. It is plainly this, that an adult might be admitted to profess the Jewish religion, by a faith in the promises of the covenant of circumcision, all of which were temporal, whereas, a person to be admitted a member of the New testament church, must have saving faith in the promises of the covenant of grace, of such doctrines, the simple statement, is a sufficient refutation.

'In the 4th place baptism differs from circum-'cision, in the character of its administrators. Pa-'rents, relations, or civil officers, performed the 'rite of circumcision. Thus Zipporah circumci-'sed the son of Moses; Joshua circumcised the 'Jews.* Baptism is an ordinance connected with 'the ministry of Jesus Christ.' Page 13.

Mr. C. is evidently at a great loss to invent differences between these ordinances; or he would never have tried this difference. To expose it, however, and give the most ignorant reader an op-

*This example of Joshua circumcising the Jews, proves that civil officers did it—Mr. C. you should have told your readers that Joshua did it, in the same way king Solomon built the temple. I suppose neither Solomon nor Joshua touched either of these pieces of labor.

portunity of judging of its true merit, we shall give one of a similar kind. On his plan of argument, I shall prove this position: that offering sacrifices before the flood, and for 600 years after, was entirely distinct in its nature and end, from the ordinance, from that time to the death of Christ. And I establish this position from a well known fact, that prior to the Aaronic priesthood, every person offered their own sacrifices. A king of Judah, for offering sacrifices, was struck with the plague of Leprosy, which deed, would, however, have been perfectly warrantable, prior to the delivering of the law from Mt. Sinai. Now although my *difference* possesses all the force of the one which Mr. C. presents, yet will any person be so ignorant as to believe me?

Christ Jesus, as the alone head of the church, possesses the alone right of instituting its ordinances, and appointing administrators as he pleases. He instituted the ordinance of circumcision; and as long as the initiating seal of the covenant of grace was administred in the rite of circumcision, he made no special appointment of administrators. But when he changed the form of the seal, HE appointed special administrators for the ordinance. This difference merits no further attention.

'In the 5th place baptism differs from circum-
'cision, in its emblematical import. Baptism is
'emblematical of our death unto sin, our burial
'with Christ, and our resurrection with him, into
'newness of life. Circumcision was a sign of the
'separation of the Jews, from all the human fami-
'ly; and it was a type of the death, or circumci-
'sion of Christ.' Page 13.

Perhaps I do not understand Mr. C's. mode of expression, although we should grant all that he

says*, still it is difficult to perceive the difference. The *sum*, of Mr. C's statement is, that baptism is emblematical of our deliverance from sin, and of our union to Christ: so that we die with him and live with him. And of circumcision, that it was a separation of the Jews from the rest of the world, and a typical representation of the death of Christ. Because if we be delivered from sin, and united to Christ, as he says baptism imports; and by circumcision separated and distinguished from the world, and directed by faith‡ to the death of Christ, which he says is its typical import; why then distinguish it from baptism, which he declares to be emblematical of our burial with Christ? This difference, if language has any meaning, so far from distinguishing, concedes the two ordinances to be one in import.

---

*Mr. C. in his strictures, does not, indeed, approbate, in high language, Mr. W's. understanding; he will therefore, more readily forgive his dullness of perception.

‡Mr. C. has conceded more in this difference, than some of his readers, perhaps are aware. He has told us, that circumcision was typical of the death of Christ, how will this comport with some other declarations, 'it was carnal.' 'It sealed temporal blessings only?' I have added the words *by faith*, because there is no other way for either New or Old testament saints, righteously to view the death of Christ: although I believe the author would not have put them in. Notwithstanding of all Paul says about the faith of Old testament saints, Mr. C. says very little about it.

In this "difference, as in many other places, we are indebted to Mr. C. for the invention of a new doctrine, that 'circumcision was a type of the death of Christ.' Had this idea been revealed to Paul in his public dispute with Peter, it would have finished his opponent. Had he proved to Peter, that circumcision was a shadow, Peter would have united with him in declaring, that it must have disappeared upon the coming of the substance. But Paul was more fond of truth than of novelty; and takes the Pedo-Baptist ground, that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace, as administered under the Old testament; and therefore, he who affixed this seal made himself a 'debtor to the whole law;' As any person would be bound to all the items of a bond, who would subscribe his hand and set his seal. Circumcision was, I grant, performed in an age of types; many typical things were in connexion with it; but that it was a typical rite, I never before understood. There is a "difference between that which is typical and that which is emblematical. Circumcision was the latter, but not the former, Let us however, take a view of the natural import of these ordinances.

1st. The doctrine taught in circumcision, was the regeneration of the heart, Deut. 3. 3, 6. 'And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart,' compared with passages already quoted. This intimates the true import of the rite of circumcision, that the sword in the hand of the spirit, could separate sin from the soul. We find the *word* employed by the Holy Spirit for this purpose in the work of regeneration, Heb. 4. 12. 'For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the divid-

ing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow.' It would be absurd to apply any rite to a subject of which it was not emblematical; but circumcision is used as descriptive of regeneration. The work of regeneration, therefore, was pointed out in circumcision.* That this same doctrine is taught in scripture, is not denied.

2nd. Circumcision is used to express external holiness, or holiness as manisfested in the language of a believer; thus we find uncircumcision applied to designate the contrary of that holiness, Ex. 6. 12. 'How then shall Pharaoh hear me, who am a man of uncircumcised lips?' We find the prophet Isaiah, used the word unclean in the same sense; Isaiah, 6. 5. 'I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips.' Now, because the want of water constitutes a person unclean, or the washing of it, clean, and this is true in a moral sense with respect to baptism; and, because uncircumcision was used to point out the same kind of unclean-

*All that Mr. C. says on this subject is lost. He finds it always easier, to reply to doctrines he invented for his opponent, than to reply to those his opponent did use. Let us hear him: 'To 'substantiate this answer, Mr. W. quoted, Deut. '30. 6. From which verse he attempted to prove, 'that the promise *to circumcise their heart*, implied 'all spiritual blessings!' Mr. W. did not say so; what he said, was that for God to circumcise the heart, implied that the subject was interested in all the spiritual blessings of the covenant of grace; because that the heart that is regenerated, will also be sanctified, and the person, in due time, Glorified. I have said Mr. C. lost his subject, we

ness, it follows, that the ordinances of circumcision and baptism were of the same import; and therefore, baptism, because it was of the same signification, came in the room of circumcision. But, that their import was the same, will appear by observing,

3rd. That the want of circumcision declared the character of a person unholy. So the sons of Jacob refused to have any connexion with the men of Shechem, until they became circumcised, Gen. 24. So, throughout the whole Old testament scriptures, by way of contempt, the heathens are called uncircumcised. But, that the want of baptism will imply the same unholiness of character will not be denied. It follows, that as it respects the character of persons, the import of these ordinances were the same; and, therefore, baptism might come in the room of circumcision.

But why should any, declaring the scriptures to be the word of God, dispute this point? The Old and New testament scriptures, unite on this subject, in declaring their import to be the same, particularly in regeneration, the great leading

---

dispute respecting the nature of circumcision; Mr. C. denied, Mr. W. affirmed, that regeneration was the true import of the ordinance of circumcision. It was not introduced by Mr. W. as Mr. C. has it, P. 77, to prove that the import of the two covenants were the same; but, to prove that the import of the two ordinances, Circumcision and Baptism were the same. Thus, by misrepresentation, he takes care never fairly to discuss, or even confute this assertion, that regeneration was the true import of the rite of circumcision.

doctrine taught in baptism. So the want of ears to hear, is used invariably in scripture, to denote the want of a heart opened by the spirit of God. 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.' But uncircumcision of the ear, is used to denote this. Jer. 6. 10 'To whom shall I speak and give warning, that they may hear? Behold, their ear is uncircumcised, and they cannot harken.' We find Stephen, in a New testament discourse, preached immediately before his death, use this word in the same sense. Acts, 7. 51. 'Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit.'

A subject so plainly taught in scripture should not be controverted. But so it is, and such it will be, in every age, with the deluded votaries of miserable systems; Mr. C. takes a plan, P. 77 to divert the reader from the true signification of the expression, to circumcise. 'In the days of Moses, it was a promise, relating to events then future.' I reply, that as it respects the subject in dispute, I care not whether it respects events, future or present; it is the import of the rite itself, upon which we dispute. Is it used to signify regeneration? is the question; whether the regeneration of New or Old testament saints? Let Mr. C. gain his point, as it respects futurity, we have gained it, in signification,* the only thing in dispute.

*This 77, P. of Mr. C's work, is sufficient to destroy his whole theory, although he had been orthodox in every other point, and to my mind it bears strong evidence of this fact; that, while he is struggling hard to obtain converts to his public theory, he does not believe it himself. e. g. 'I

This difference, the Baptist have always made; because they are determined that circumcision shall be proved to be a rite only carnal. They know, if the contrary is proven, their peculiar system is no more. 'Let God be true, and every man a liar.' After all their exertions, they have lost their aim. It is not a national distinction, for it did not distinguish them from other nations. It was no security for the possession of the land of Canaan, because many of the specified subjects of the Old covenant, never did inherit that land, although they were as willing and obedient as those were, who did inherit it; and every thing else taught by circumcision is also taught by Baptism.

6th. Difference. 'Baptism differs from circum-

---

will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed,' (this word *seed*, Mr. C. with his usual freedom, calls *children*. I would be sorry to use the same freedom with the scriptures,) he declares respects futurity and for the proof of this, cites the denunciations and promises mentioned in the same chapter, which respects the captivity of the Jews and their return. And, therefore, this promise of the circumcision of the heart could not take place until more than Eight hundred years after it was given. This denies, that any Old testament saint, until that time, could apply this promise; or, in other words, that there were none circumcised in heart, until after their return, from the Babylonish captivity; a fact, which neither Mr. C. nor any of his followers can believe. If I have now done, as Mr. Ralston did, let the world see his system, he will, no doubt, add it to his list of misrepresentations.

'cision in the part of the system, that was the 'subject of the operation. Pedo Baptists apply 'water to the face. Surely they do not suppose 'that the Jews circumcised in the face. Baptists 'apply water to the whole person. Neither Bap-'tist nor Pedo Baptist applies water to the precise 'part affected in the rite of circumcision.' P. 13.

It is difficult for me to discover any other design in this difference; than a little prophane sport. Even Mr. C. could not think that this difference could possibly do any thing for his system. But, lest any reader should be so ignorant, as not to discover his sophism, we shall undress it, and let him see it as it is. Did baptism come in the room of circumcision? Mr. C. says, No. Why? he answers, because the same *precise* parts of the human body are not affected by the rites. That, although circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace, and of the same covenant, that baptism also is a seal, yet the one could not come in the room of the other, because the same *precise* parts were not affected in the rites.

The weight of the objection, will appear, by a plain example. The Congress of the United States, 40 years ago, ordained that any persons, in giving bonds, notes, &c. should subscribe their names, and affix a *cross*, for a seal. Last session they repealed that statute; and ordained that a *circular mark* made with a pen, after signing the name, should be the seal of such obligations. Mr. C's heading the faction, declares that the *circular mark* could not possibly come in the room of the *cross mark*, for this unanswerable reason, that it is not the same shape, or if, by the same act of Congress, the part of the paper on which the signature and seal were to be affixed, was also chang-

ed, then by Mr. C. the *cross mark* cannot come in the room of the *circular mark* because the seal was to be found on a different part of the paper, on which the bond was written.

More than three thousand years ago, Christ Jesus, the supreme authority over the church, ordained, that the cutting off a piece of flesh, should, as a mark, be a seal of the blessings contained in the covenant of grace. Nearly eighteen hundred years ago, he changed the external form of the seal, and, instead of the painful rite of circumcision, he appointed the application of water. Who will hence argue, that *therefore*, baptism did not come in the room of circumcision? Mr. C. will perhaps, say, that he has not granted that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace. He has not indeed granted this; but I observe that the *subject* in dispute, is not thereby affected. He may call these seals or not, as he pleases; but he is here proving that the one could not come in the room of the other, because they affected different parts of the body. The reasons for this assertion, is the only thing here to which we have called the attention of the reader.

7th. Difference. 'Baptism differs from circum-
' cision in the blessings it conveys. Circumcision
' conveyed no spiritual blessings. Baptism
' conveys no temporal, but spiritual blessings.'
Page 13.

To this difference I have already fully replied. Had the assertion of Mr C. in this place been true, it would have indeed affected the point; but we have proven that the blessings sealed were the same; which ends all the intended force of this difference. From the bantering commencement of Mr. C. on these seven points of difference, we ex-

pected that he would have attempted to have established his position, by such arguments as affected the nature of the ordinances. No—he superficially calls the attention of his readers to those external points of difference, which although they had been true, would not have affected the point in question; this last difference is the only exception, and its assertion, upon investigation, is found not true.

We shall now take some view of the different methods of escape, by which he tries to rid himself of the force of objections.

'With regard to their not circumcising on the '8th day for 40 years; while travelling to Caanan; 'it is nothing to the purpose; for this plain reason, 'that circumcision, during this period, was entire-'ly given up. It was performed at no age.' P. 18.

What was the intention of Mr. C. by this observation? It was to save himself from being caught in a plain absurdity. He had been proving that baptism could not come in the room of circumcision, because it was essential, to the *being* of this rite, that it be administered on the 8th day. It appears Mr. W. had denied the truth of his assertion, and declared that, by divine command, hundreds of thousands of the Jews, had been circumcised between their birth and fortieth year; no covenant alteration could be made upon the passage in Joshua, upon which the assertion was founded. However, the part quoted from Mr. C's book accounts for it, and the reason is plain; that during this period, circumcision was entirely given up. I grant this, Mr. C.—but what will your *plain reason* prove? this is the alone conclusion, that there were 40 years the Jews did not circumcise; but every person grants this. Yet the matter in dis-

pute is not thereby affected. The dispute is, is there any thing in the nature of the rite of circumcision, or any thing in the divine command that forbids the administration of it, on any other time, than on the eighth day? On the omission of it for 40 years, we agree; but, to account for the administration of it upon those with whom it had been omitted for 40 years, is the difficulty. Mr. C says it was confined to the 8th day; the scripture says it was not; and might with propriety be admitted at any period of life.

Any person who can read his bible, may detect the falacy of his plan of *plain reasoning*. They will indeed see, that the Jews were required to be circumcised on the 8th day; but they will find that the requisition, was not essential to the being of an ordinance; because it was omitted for 40 years, at one time, and after that during the whole period of its continuation in the church, proselytes, at any age, were circumcised. But, if the argument used by Mr. C. had any force, it would prove, that in order legally to administer the rite of circumcision, it was as necessary to perform it on the 8th day of the persons life, as it was to cut off a piece of flesh. It is not the circumstances accompanying the rite about which we dispute; but we dispute respecting those things essential to the being of the rite itself. Where now, Mr. C. is your *plain reasoning*, to prove that it was essential to the being of the ordinance to administer it on the 8th day?

But Mr. C. objects to the assertion, that one ordinance came in the room of another. 'It ap-
'pears to me a gross departure from analogy, from
'the meaning of Jewish rites, and from matter of
'fact, to say: 'That baptism came in the room of

'circumcision.' The sacred scriptures do not, 'as far as I can understand them, ever lead us to 'think that one rite came in the room of another, 'but they teach us, that Christ came in the room of 'all the Jewish rites—he is our passover, our cir-'cumcision & our sacrifice.' P. 19. By saying that one ordinance came in the room of another, means no more, than that the latter occupies the room of the former. All the ordinances of the New testament came in the room of those that were under the Old testament, or we have these ordinances, instead of those the church formerly had. When we say that the particular rite of baptism, came in the room of circumcision, we mean that baptism occupies the same place in the present dispensation of grace, that circumcision occupied under the former.

Scarcely a single ordinance now has the same precise form it had under the Old testament; even the dispensation of the word by the Gospel ministry, is now different, from that which it was then. Will Mr. C. argue that the preaching of the gospel, under the New testament, by gospel ministers, did not come in the room of that teaching by priests and prophets under the ceremonial law? we mean no more than this, when we say that baptism came in the room of circumcision.

But this is an age of novelty. 'Christ came in the room of all Jewish rites.' That HE came the *substance* of all Jewish rites, at least such of them as were required by the ceremonial law, none will deny; but, that he came in their room, I suppose none except Mr. C. ever thought. Christ is indeed called 'our passover:' because he was 'the Lamb of God' typically 'slain from the foundation of the world.' HE was the substance, of

which all the rites of that feast were the shadows; but no hint is given that he came in the room of the passover.

Let us hear him further on this subject. 'I 'would now ask my opponent, If baptism came in 'the room of circumcision, why were so many 'thousands of the Jews baptised, who had been pre-'viously circumcised? This, on the principles of 'my opponent, was a mere tautology. If baptism 'and circumcision are alike, the same seals of 'the same covenant, why administer both to the 'same subjects?' P. 19. In reply I observe,

1st. That in the change of a dispensation, the members then existing, must be the subjects of both dispensations. The same individual persons, whose duty it was to have offered sacrifices during the life and public ministry of Christ on earth, would have been guilty of a gross violation of the Divine law, had they continued the same practices after his death. In like manner circumcision was a duty which a parent was bound to discharge, until another ordinance took its place; but the substitution of baptism in its room, as completely destroyed the sacramental existence of circumcision, as if it never had an existence.

2nd. It is impossible to make the same persons subjects of both dispensations, without making them the partakers of the ordinances of both. By their circumcision, they acknowledged all the means of grace, sealed to them under that dispensation, in their particular form of administration; but the same persons in their baptism, publickly acknowledged the change, declared themselves members of the new dispensation of the same covenant, and thereby openly acknowledged that Christ the substance of all the cerimonial law, was

come, and put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Mr. C. should have shewn us in what manner, the same persons could have been constituted members of both dispensations of grace, without giving them the seals of both. He keeps his distance from this point, lest he might be taken in a *snare of truth.* Circumcision, according to Mr. C. sealed to them the earthly Canaan. Then by baptism they renounced all claim to that country; every man lost his title to his farm. By circumcision they declared themselves the natural seed of Abraham, although they had been Hittites or Amorites; by baptism, they declared they were not his seed. By circumcision they incorporated themselves with the Jewish nation. By baptism they disclaimed their own nation. These are Mr. C's. *odd* doctrines—who can believe him?

The truth is, that those saints who were on earth, during the life, death and resurrection of Christ, were members of the Old testament church, by their circumcision; and by baptism, were constituted members of the New testament church.

3rd. Baptism was a New testament seal; it secured all the covenant blessings, sealed by circumcision; the covenant was the same, but the form of the seal was very different, as was the whole dispensation. It was necessary in the change of dispensation, that there should also be a change of seal; but, at the time of this change, there could be no change of persons; it follows that those who had been initiated by circumcision into the former, must now be admitted into the latter, by baptism. As they lived under both dispensations of grace, how could they otherwise be initiated into both?

But, in order to confirm his assertion on this

point, he presents you with a strange supposition. 'Upon the same principle, if all the Jews had liv-'ed to that time, and believed, they would all have 'been baptized. What would have come of their 'circumcision then?' P. 19. I answer, the same thing that came of all their sacrifices, temple worship, &c. Instead of which we have now our New testament worship. Abraham, the first initiated by circumcision, as a seal, 'saw the day afar off' when baptism would take the room of circumcision, 'and was glad.' With the same propriety I might ask, If all the Jews that ever existed, had lived, when baptism was introduced, what would have come of their sacrifices then?

The difference of the efficacy of these two ordinances, forms another strong reason with Mr. C. why baptism could not come in the room of circumcision. His observations scarcely, however, merit transcription. 'Although they had the be-'nefit of circumcision for so many hundred years, 'Moses declares, 'The Lord hath not given you 'an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to 'hear, *unto this day*. Where now, are the spiritu-'al blessings promised to the subjects of circum-'cision as such! What spiritual blessings had it 'secured for so long a time!! P. 77. This appears rather like a *wilful* misconstruction of scripture. Mr. C. infers from the passage quoted, that for several hundred years, the subjects of circumcision had not been regenerated, justified, or santified. Then, he asks with an air of triumph, what good had their circumcision done them? Were there no saints during these several hundred years? He does not deny there were saints under that dispensation; nay, he even condescends to grant it; P. 44. For, although he supposes 'Ju-

daism to be no better than Gentilism,' yet *somehow* there were saints at that time. But saints as they were, 'they had not a heart to perceive, eyes to see, and ears to hear.' Will this do for a true character of saints? no. What then must be the true import of the words? That notwithstanding the administration of grace to these people for 400 years, there were many found who had not 'hearts to perceive, eyes to see, and ears to hear.' Which is equally true of Gospel despisers in every age of the church. With these, circumcision had the same influence, that baptism had with Simon Magus, or with any other subject that is not regenerated.

If Mr. C's. observation has any meaning, it is, that baptism has some intrinsic efficacy in giving 'hearts to perceive, eyes to see, and ears to hear.' For otherwise, there can be no difference, even intended. He then acquiesces in the doctrines of the Fathers who hold baptism to be regeneration, for if it be not, what efficacy has it, more than circumcision. Therefore Mr. C. should not touch the Fathers, or the Roman Catholicks on this point.

Perhaps Mr. C. will clear himself by his usual 'as such.' Was Moses speaking to them as the subjects of the covenant of circumcision? Mr. C. should answer, no; beause 'hearts to perceive, eyes to see, and ears to hear,' were spiritual blessings; and therefore did not belong to that covenant. Will Mr. C. say he was addressing them, as the subjects of that covenant? He then relinquishes the point in dispute. If he says the contrary, his 'as such' will be of no use.

The above is an instance of Mr. C's. honesty. It is evident from P. 44, that he believes there were saints at that time; yet, now, when he has

another purpose to answer, he will give this passage a contrary, signification. Although he should succeed in proving what he intends, that there were no saints at that time, he still fails in establishing this difference. The extent of our assertion is, that the grace and other spiritual blessings, which Old testament believers had, were sealed to them by circumcision; but, if his assertion be true, still circumcision sealed as much to them as baptism does to the unregenate persons baptized. But, if they were saints, then circumcision sealed to them, that which baptism seals to saints now.

Upon Mr. C's. attempt to prove that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, the following observations will be found true.

1st. That he is compelled to change his ground, and adopt principles *new* even to baptists; assertions, at which Dr. Gill or Mr. Booth would have blushed. He finds no difficulty in asserting that circumcision was not a religious ordinance; that it secured a country to millions who never saw it, neither they, nor their seed. What will reflecting minds think of this doctrine? or does Mr. C. think he is writing to people of the 12th century, or to those who will at all times be satisfied with round assertion?

2nd. It is evident that he does not appear serious in any thing he says on that subject. Had he possessed sufficient candor to have carried out any system on this point, it must either have been too ridiculous for even his *friends* to have believed; or else, after all his opposition, he would have established the assertion, that baptism came in the room of circumcision; but in this he dare not proceed; he often suddenly stops and fills the *vacuum*

with declamations; e. g. P. 77, 78. He joins with fanaticks, in rejoicing in their *new light*. As Mr. C. fails in language, to express his detestation of Pedo-Baptism;—so the shakers fail in either songs or tunes, to celebrate their discovery that the resurrection is past; that they are now glorified saints: and, therefore, use *reels*, &c. without words, to express it. With them Mr. C. exclaims, 'O human tradition, how hast thou biassed the 'judgment and blinded the eyes of them that 'should know.'

V. PROPOSITION.

That infants of professing parents are fit members of the visible church; and may be acknowledged such, by administering to them *baptism*, an initiating seal of the covenant of grace.

We establish the truth of this proposition; first, from the moral relation existing between parents, and children. Relation always precedes obligation, and is of the same nature. Natural obligation springs from natural relation; moral obligation, from moral relation. These principles, I believe, are not denied. Parents, in virtue of this moral relation, are bound to use every means, both by example and precept, to 'train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' And children, upon the same principle, are bound to receive and obey this instruction. Hence the divine declaration respecting Abraham, Gen. 18. 19. 'For I know him, that he will command his children, and his household after him.' The existence of this relation, and the promise for the continuation of it in the chruch; was a comfortable

doctrine to King Hezekiah in his affliction. Isaiah, 38. 19. 'The father to the children, shall make known thy truth.'

If it be a fact, that there is such a relation between parents and children, and such privileges resulting from it, then I ask, where is the impropriety in giving children the seal of these blessings? or are Baptists prepared to say, that children shall be the heirs of these privileges, and yet be denied the seal of them. That this principle may be more fully understood, I shall make a few plain observations.

1st. That moral obligation may exist in its full force, where there is no natural relation, as is often the case between rulers and subjects, guardians and children placed under their care; but, at the same time a covenant is supposed to exist, which secures to both parties, privileges, to which each are entitled, according to the stipulations of this covenant. While this relation subsists, neither of the parties can divest themselves of the obligation or lose their title to the privileges; only by forfeiture there is a dissolution of contract.

2nd. That infants may be the subjects of such a covenant is evident from fact. A nation, consisting of rulers and ruled, are mutually bound to each other by covenant. But the children of citizens are entitled to all the security and protection of their parents; and this, while in a state of infancy, before they can give any consent to the national constitution or covenant. It follows, that babes are a party in a covenant, entitled to its privileges, and grow up under its obligation, when they possess no knowledge of either.

Now, it is vain to stop and ask, what good does it do these children to have them constituted

members of such a nation, when they have no knowledge of its constitution or laws. Suffice it to say, that, in every age of the world, it was a fact, it was their privilege, and establishes this principle, so much hated by the Baptists, that children may possess a seal to a covenant, and have its privileges before they can have any knowledge of it.*

3rd. That a family, consisting of parents and children, is a nation in miniature, and granted by all, to be the first beginning of civil government. And it fares with a family as it does with a nation. According to the state of the nation, with respect to privileges, the state of the subjects, are good or bad. So is it with a family. If the parents are poor, so are the children, if rich, the children are born the heirs of the estate; and this is secured to the children by contract, although the parents should die intestate, and the children be infants at the time of their death. In a word, whatever is the privilege of the parents, is, in a greater or less degree, the privilege of their children also.

4th. That this moral relation existing between parents and children, is formed by God himself, as truly as he constituted the relation between kings and subjects under a theocratical government. While infants are incapable of watching over themselves in any degree, HE has appointed their parents their guardians.

But, when we view this subject, and consider

*I shall afterwards shew, in its proper place, that this principle is conceded by baptists, in constituting children members of a national covenant by circumcision.

these principles in the church, 'a holy nation, a peculiar people,' they appear in all their force. It is surely granted that it is the privilege of children to have Godly professing parents, to have parents under vows to God in the church, to warn them according to the laws of his house, and teach them the worth of their own privilege, by giving them suitable religious institutions.

Parents, I grant, are morally bound to this duty; but professing parents are bound, by covenant to these duties; and to these they have engaged when they affixed a seal to the covenant of grace.

The doctrine of the covenant of works, establishes the truth of my assertion. Although in many respects, the relation between Adam and his posterity, is very different from that relation existing between parents and children, yet, in this they agree, that Adam was constituted an agent for his family, the human race; so that all who spring from him, partake of the effects of his agency. In like manner, parents are divinely constituted agents of their respective families. The violation of the positive precept in the covenant of works by Adam, was the violation of the same by all his posterity: or had he partaken of the tree of life in a state of innocency, it would have been a seal securing to him and all his posterity, the blessings found in that covenant, although the same posterity was unborn. The reason of this was, he was, by God, appointed their fœderal head, and in law they were constituted one. If a nation employ an embassador, with powers plenipotentiary, his contract is theirs; and according to the contract, the nation enjoys benefits, or receives trouble.

As in the case of Adam, so also in the case of

all parents; the Divine Being chose them. In the choice, children have no agency whatever.

But this doctrine, as it represents the covenant of works, is materially conceded by Mr C. p. 159. 'The token or seal of this transaction, was the 'tree of life; which was to him a token, and formal 'guarentee, that life would be enjoyed, on condi-'tion of his obedience:' which of course would have been the same to all his posterity. I therefore argue, and that from principles conceded; that, if the moral relation of Adam to his posterity was such, that a seal, through him, could be administered to every one of his children, although unborn; and this because he was divinely constituted their agent; that, therefore, a seal, through the relation of parents to their children, may be justly administered to their children, after they are born.

In all the transactions of life, by contract, the doctrine of infant baptism is recognized, we bind ourselves and our heirs. Considering the minority of our children, we deal for them, under this consideration, that we are their agents and they incapable of understanding. We mention duties to be performed by them, and in their name we seal contracts. The conduct even of baptists, contradict their theory on baptism. Their principles, if true, destroys almost all contracts in life. I therefore reason:

If parents may contract and seal the same for their infant offspring; then infant baptism is right. But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

But take a look at the baptists syllogism.

If children, by their ignorance and want of faith, are incapable of understanding the contract, or covenant of grace; then children must not be bap-

tized. But the former is true and therefore the latter.

Apply the same argument to other things and you will immediately see its genuine force.

If children by their ignorance and want of knowledge, are incapable of understanding a contract, or covenant; then children must not be parties in a covenant, or contract. But the former is true and therefore the latter. Now, every person that ever saw a bond or *will*, knows this conclusion to be false. But such is the argument of baptists against infant baptism.

The doctrine of infant baptism is universally recognized in scripture. It was entirely unnecessary either to give any precept in so many words, requiring the baptism of infants; or yet mention the case of individual children baptized. This seal, in scripture, was established in the chuch, for more than a thousand years, and thousands of examples given us of infants initiated by it; and, although, as we have shewn, the form of the seal differed, yet its nature did not undergo any change. To this seal the Jews had been accustomed from its first institution in Abraham. There could be no necessity to repeat that so well understood by the ancient church.

It would indeed have been an evident curtailing of the privileges of the church of Christ, had the infants of the New testament, been excluded from that security, or from those privileges to which infant members of the Old testament church were entitled. They would have complained, that the children of their fathers were received members of the visible church, while their children were excluded. Nay, that they enjoyed a seal of the covenant of grace, an intimation of their

security, right and title of its blessings; while their children must be raised like the children of heathens.

The baptists, from this specious but false reason, deny the warrantableness of infant baptism; because, the persons baptized, are not only incapable of believing, but also of discharging the duties required in the covenant. While yet, it will be easily made appear, that they concede the principles of Pedo Baptists in full. They declare that the rite of circumcision constituted the infants of the Jews, members of their nation. 'The promise 'of the covenant of circumcision was not,' says Mr. C. 'made to the Jews, as members of the church; 'but of the nation.'

It is granted, that infant children are not only incapable of believing, but also of discharging the duties required of professing members. But I assert, that they are as capable of discharging the duties required of professing members of the visible church, as they are of doing the duties of a civil citizen. Accordingly, on Mr. C's plan of reasoning, I argue that circumcision was not a seal of admission into the Jewish nation, because it was absurd, to constitute any person a civil citizen, who was incapable of discharging any of the duties of that character. The moment a person acquires citizenship, they are entitled to as many of the privileges as they are capable of enjoying; and bound by all the laws of the nation. Why then does Mr C. and other baptists, make such a lamentable outcry against the Pedo Baptists, for constituting persons members of the visible church, because they are incapable of believing, or obeying the divine law, in any respect, seeing they, at the same time, argue that infants were, by the

divine command, constituted members of a civil kingdom, and agreed that they were placed in such circumstances, as that they are under every civil obligation, and yet are unable to discharge any of the duties of that relation? Let us compare the baptist and Pedo Baptist concessions on this subject, and their similarity will strike any reader.

Bap. A child, as the member of a nation, is entitled to the security and protection of that nation.

P. Bap. A child, as the member of a church, is entitled to the security and protection of Christ, the King and Head of the church.

Bap. A child, as the member of a nation, has a temporal subsistence secured by the promise of that nation.

P. Bap. A child, as the member of the church, has a spiritual subsistence secured by the promise of Christ, King and Head of the church.

Bap. A child, although in a state of infancy, was constituted the public member of a nation by covenant, and the same confirmed by circumcision, a public seal of the same.

P. Bap. A child, although in a state of infancy, is constituted a public member of the church by covenant, and the same confirmed by baptism, a public seal of the same.

It is hence evident, that, by whatever argument a baptist will urge against a Pedo baptist, that a child is disqualified by its infancy from becoming a member of the church, a Pedo baptist will urge, precisely the same against their becoming members of a nation. And I might further add, that an infant citizen of a nation is bound, in virtue of the relation in which it stands to the nation, to become acquainted with the laws of its nation, and to render obedience to the same.

In like manner, an infant citizen of the kingdom of Christ, is bound by virtue of the relation in which it stands to the church, to become acquainted with her laws, and yield obedience to the same. It follows, that every possible objection which Mr. C. or any baptist, can bring against the church membership of infants, stands equally against their citizenship; and on the contrary, we may justly argue upon the principles of common sense, that as children, by circumcision, even by the concession of the baptists, are constituted members of a kingdom, in which activity is required, and yet are incapable of being active: There is nothing absurd in constituting them members of the visible church, in which nothing more is required, in relation to its laws.

Mr. C. spends a considerable time, in sporting upon this question, 'what good does infant sprinkling do its subjects.' I reply that, allowing the difference of relation and privilege, it does as much good, as constituting them citizens of a civil kimgdom by circumcision. They are equally capable of obeying the laws, and enjoying the privilege of both.

We shall now attend to his view of this subject. His great levity of expression, so inconsistent with the solemn subject, shall not receive any further notice, than what is absolutely necessary to do his arguments justice.

'When I hear any Pedo-Baptist, pleading for the 'baptism of infants, upon the footing of the faith 'of the parents, that is, on the footing of carnal 'generation, it brings to my recollection, the re-'ply of John the baptist, made to the Jews, who 'solicited baptism, upon the footing of their great, 'great, great, many times great grand father, 'Abraham. They were as confident of the valid-

'ity of their claim, as any modern Pedo-Baptist.' Page, 20, 21.

In what sense does Mr. C. use the word *faith.* If by it, he means any thing more, than the faith of parents expressed by their public profession, he has been terrified by an apparition, the creature of his own brain. An honest writer who makes the edification of his opponent an object, will take care to use the words in the sense, in which they are commonly used. He must know that Pedo-Baptists, mean no more, when they 'plead for the baptism of infants, upon the footing of the faith of the parents;' than we do when we say, that Jacob should be circumcised, when an infant, because Isaac his father, was a public professor in the church—we mean no more than Mr. C. does when he says that Joseph should be circumcised at eight days old, because a title to the land of Canaan was vested in Isaac his father, and a promise made of that land to him, through his father. Or if any should have asked King David; if he believed in the doctrine of circumcising infants, he would have replied, yes: he even solicited circumcision 'upon the footing of his great, great, great many times great grand father Abraham.'*

Parents having claimed the promises of the covenant of grace for themselves, and having declared the same by a public profession, have, in the divine constitution of things, the seal of the same

*The reader will forgive me for using Mr. C's. language, I only do it, to let you see that his language is equally subversive of the rite of circumcision. I do, indeed, think his language profane, I believe that he is only making sport on the subject of Baptism.

privileges offered to their children. In the same sense, that God gave the promise to Abraham, and his children, Peter declares to his congregation 'the promise is to you and your children.' The promise to Abraham was, 'I will be thy God and the God of thy seed.'

But what connexion did Mr. C. find between the expressions, 'upon the footing of the faith of the parents,' and 'upon the footing of carnal generation.' The scripture calls Abraham the father of the faithful. Does Mr. C. suppose that he was the carnal father of all the faithful? If he does not, why does he use the expression as proving the same signification? I am afraid that during all the time he was a Pedo-Baptist, he was ignorant of their doctrines, and this, the probable reason, why he forsook them.

I suppose Mr. C. never heard a Pedo-Baptist plead for a right to the baptism of children 'upon the footing of carnal generation.' That, upon the footing of carnal relation existing between parents and children, carnal benefits flow, is not denied; this is justly plead as the ground for the possession of estates, &c.. But, that any spiritual privileges flow, merely on the footing of carnal relation, is never plead. The Jews were the carnal descendants of Abraham. He was their natural father. They were his natural seed. But ask the apostle Paul, if this be the ground on which they received their spiritual blessings; he answers, no—It was not because they were his children by nature, but because they were the children of the promise. It follows that the children of professing parents, according to the flesh, are also their seed by promise, and are thereby entitled to a seal of the promise.

The true covenant relation existing between Abraham and the Jews, when they came to John to be baptized, I believe, was neither understood by them, or their successor in opinion, Mr. C. Had these Jews come forward, humbly asking the the privilege of baptism, as a people in professed covenant with God, and therefore Abraham's seed, John would have baptized them without reproof. But it appears they were of the mind, with those men of straw, with whom Mr. C. contends, that a carnal relation was the only 'entitling prerequisite,' and therefore were justly reproved when they demanded the administration of this seal. The HEAD of the church, indeed, often establishes a spiritual relation when there is a pre-existing carnal relation; but these are in their nature entirely distinct. The one may exist without the other. Believing heathens have a spiritual relation to Abraham, and this existing in its full force, being nothing impaired, by the want of carnal relation.

It is, in every case, necessary to determine, who are the persons professing this spiritual relation; this, when determined, should decide the controversy. When a promise is given, we should know the person, or persons to whom it is addressed; should you ask, to whom are the promises of the gospel addressed? I reply, to sinners as such: should you again ask, to whom is the seal of these promises to be applied? we answer, to those who by a covenant relation declare that the blessings promised, are theirs. Let us search the scriptures to find out these persons. The whole Bible, with one voice, declares that these belong to believing parents and their seed. And that of such persons, the church of Christ is constituted. Let the following observation be admitted.

1st. That the church all holds, at least, a visible covenant relation to Christ.

2nd. That the members of the church have a professed covenant relation to one another.

3rd. That when God entered into a covenant relation with Abraham, every item of that covenant was also made with his seed, as truly the babe as the adult. The only qualification there specified, was, that they be his seed. Neither the apostle Peter, nor any other Pedo-Baptist, has plead for any thing more, than that which is contained in the assertion. 'The promise is to you, and to your children.' We therefore infer that those persons, found in the covenant relation, may justly receive the seal of all its covenant blessings. All this may be true, without any carnal relation. Let us hear him a little further.

'Mr. W. tells us, that infants may, if they are 'obedient to the divine law, after they grow up re-'ceive benefit from baptism.* This is an honest, 'though I presume, an unintentional confession, 'that they receive no benefit from it; either at the 'time of receiving it, or immediately after. But 'he has said, that infants in the act of baptism, are 'laid under an obligation to obedience; that the 'vows of God are upon them thenceforth. Let 'me ask how many years old are they, when they 'recognize this obligation.' P. 33.

The substance of the quotation is, that no benefit results from 'infant sprinkling;' of this he frequently gives hints. But in his appendix, we have a black list of evils, resulting from it. P. 180. I

*This is a part of Mr. C's. edition of Mr. W's. speeches; and is as honest, as his edition of many parts of the bible.

reply, that benefit, may either be, sensibly or insensibly received. An infant or idiot, of parents in easy and independent circumstances, receives more benefit than the children of parents in difficult circumstances of life: they are insensible, however, of any such difference. Yet they derive these superior favors, upon the same precise principles, upon which we plead for infant baptism, that is, *relation.* Because, infants receive previleges according to the standing of their parents. They are either rich or poor, as their parents are in riches or poverty.

This assersion of Mr. C's. lies against the strongest evidence of fact. Because a child, if it lives, receives both immediate and future benefit from the relation it has to its parents. But its privileges are inconcievably extended, if the parent be religious, it has thereby secured a religious education. It is trained up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; it has an early opportunity of, ministerial instruction, being raised 'beside the shepherd's tent,' when born, or even when it becomes a living soul, an everlasting relation between it and Christ may be formed; it may, 'by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy spirit,' be as full an heir of everlasting life, as the most experienced saint. All we crave for this child is a visible seal of these blessings.

If a father die when one of his heirs is an infant, he makes it equally a partaker of his estate with those children that are grown to years of maturity, when the babe is grown, it claims the interest in the will, which was a contract, existing between the father and the child, although the child was entirely unconscious of the whole transaction, at

the time of engagement. But the want of consciousness neither affects its rights nor privileges. I suppose that none of these facts will be denied. From these principles I therefore argue,

1st. That a child may be visibly sealed an heir to the testament of Christ, from which it may, or may not, receive any benefit. An infant may be the legal heir of an estate, and yet by profligacy, or death, receive no benefit. The signature and seal of the parent, is the visible security of the child, and yet it may never secure any thing profitable to it. Mr. C. will acknowledge the truth of these assertions, because circumcision, which, according to his assertion, sealed the earthly Canaan; if the child either died in infancy, or removed into another country, it received no benefit from the seal: according to his system this painful *rite* was administered in vain.

2nd. The right of Esau, Ishmael, or Jacob to the earthly Canaan, according to the opinion of Mr. C. was the same, because they were all by divine authority, circumcised. But the posterity of one of these only, entered in; query, of what use was their infant circumcision?

3rd. There is a difference between the privileges and obligation of a bond; and discharging and enjoying the same. A man may contract in behalf of a child, by which the minor may be bound to perform certain duties, and entitled to certain privileges; and yet incapable of either doing the former, or enjoying the latter, and even if he arrives to years of maturity, may be equally inattentive to both; yet this neither affects the moral propriety or validity of the contract. Again Mr. C. what good do these seals do minors?

4th. I assert that baptism possesses the same

intrinsic validity, when applied to an infant, that it does, when administered to an adult. It does not in either case possess any saving power, so a will confirmed to an heir, when an infant possesses the same force, that it would, if the heir was an adult. In either case they lose or enjoy as they are profligate, or sober.

Baptists appear offended with those, who say, that baptism is regeneration. Mr. C. here joins the Pedo Baptists and vociferates, and by turns sports upon it, in his usual manner. Yet I fear he will be found guilty of the same error, and on this point may justly give the bond of brotherhood to Cyprian, his former enemy. If I here blame Mr. C. improperly, then what is the meaning of the question, 'what good does baptism do infants? For if it may be said that baptism abstractly considered, does good, it will follow, that it has a saving power, or it is the doctrine of Cyprian and others, that baptism is regeneration, or without union to Christ, nothing is really good.

When a baptist asks the question, 'what good does baptism do infants?' he must mean that it does some good to adults, that is, that it either regenerates them, or is an infallible seal of regeneration. The greatest hereticks on this subject, never attached any more importance to this ordinance than those just expressed. Mr. C. would refuse I suppose, to subscribe the following sentiment, not only because it stands in opposition to his question, but for a reason still more important, it is the production of the Westminster assembly. 'The 'sacraments become effectual means of salvation, 'not from any virtue in them, or in him that doth 'administer them, but by the blessing of Christ 'and the working of his spirit in them that by

'faith receive them.' Short cat quest. 91.

'I never recollect' says Mr. C. 'of any thing or-'dained for the benefit of man, or any thing en-'joined upon him, by divine authority, that had 'not some immediate advantage, resulting to the 'subject who obeyed, according to the truth. 'My opponent has placed all the advantages of 'infant sprinkling, upon a slippery, *perhaps*; upon 'a wonder working *if*.' p. 33. Was not circumcision an ordinance of divine appointment? Although you should say it was civil; I ask, Mr. C. what benefit immediately resulted to the subject of this rite? If he says national protection, so I say in the other case, church protection. For if the kings of the earth afford their infant subjects protection, the king of Zion is equally able and willing to guard his babes. The truth is, that in whatever shape, Mr. C. can turn the round assertion I have last quoted, the rite of circumcision, is ready to meet him in the face. After the child was circumcised, there was a great variety of events, casualties, &c. that it took a slippery *perhaps* and a wonder working *if*, to put him in the possession of that land, Mr. C. converts the subject upon the spot. Baptism is a Divine ordinance, immediate benefit must result. Mr. C. never recollects an instance of its failing. Peter must have been mistaken about Simon Magus, Isaac when he circumcised Esau. What a blessed thing it would be, to be baptized by Mr. C.

'But he has said infants in the act of baptism are 'laid under an obligation to obedience, that 'the vows of God are upon them. Let me ask, 'how many years old, are they, when they recog-'nise this obligation? Shall I say at 10 or 15 'years, after sprinkling.' p. 33. By this all deeds,

bonds, conveyances &c. are completely destroyed, because the person, or persons who give these instruments, bind themselves and their heirs. Instead of casting a vail over the subject, by loose declamation Mr. C. should have defined the nature of such obligations, upon children, before the age of 10 or 15 years: or let me ask Mr. C. how many years old are those children, thus bound before they are conscious of such obligations? In answering this question by whatever mode he chooses, he will answer his own query.

In page 43. he closes a declamatory speech, with this assertion, when speaking of infants. 'They are private property, the property of parents and not the property of the church, hence parents as such, have orders how to bring them up.' To look at this assertion as it is, it is sufficiently refuted.

1st. It is not the duty of the church, to see how their youth behave.

2nd. It is as absurd for ministers to direct parents, respecting the manner of training up their children as it would be for them from the pulpit to direct their members how to break horses, and train cattle for the plough, because horses, cattle, and children are equally the *private property* of farmers, and equally under the care of the pastor of the congregation.

3rd. Ministers must neither teach nor reprove children 'Shall I say under 10 or 15 years.'

4th. Hannah and her husband had no right to deliver up Samuel to the Lord, by yielding him up to the church, when he was a young child. 1, Sam. 1. 24. 28.

Mr. C. will get no serious person to yield their assent to the truth of the assertion above. Because

it is evident with all the care and attention of both ministers and parents too many of our youth grow up in carelessness; but it is indeed surprising to find a man styling himself 'Minister of the word of God' exerting all his power, to prevent ministers and others from exerting Godly influence over youth. In a word why does Mr. C. say children 'are private property, the property of pa-'rents, and not the property of the church?' Let us compare this with that which God himself says Psal. 127, 3. 'Lo children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward.'*

But Mr. C. now tries to escape by an old baptist tract; 'I ask, does not the baptism or sprinkling of

* Mr. C. can satisfy his followers with something as a cure, to any true impression, these things may make on their minds, or if they believe his view of the subject, it is because they are left 'to strong delusions to believe a lie.' Such sentiments might not have disgraced Lord Chesterfield, who taught his son to be profane, but they certainly disgrace the character Mr C. tries to assume, and which his few followers think he possesses. Whatever force such opinions can have is, without doubt, demorilizing. We have generally blamed the baptists, for raising their children, heathens, in a land where Christianity is, but these observations only respect their relation to the church. But Mr C. appears in full on the subject, and actually orders the church to let the children of their members alone, that they have nothing to do with them. 'Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice: lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.'

'an infant require a positive command? And I call 'upon my opponent to shew if there was ever a 'positive institution founded solely upon reason or 'inference.' p. 48.

What does Mr. C. mean, by *positive command* and *positive institution;* and these as distinct from moral commands? Let us here define the subject. 'By 'moral positive, or positive we understand those 'that depend entirely for their moral obligation, 'upon some express precept of the Deity; the pro- 'priety of which, nature, in its most perfect state 'could not discover. Moral precepts are such as 'respect our duty to our fellow creatures; and are 'in some degree more or less discernible by 'mankind, even now, and were perfectly so pre- 'vious to the fall.' 'In positive institutions, the 'obligation is altogether in the command; but in 'moral duties, the obligation is not only in the com- 'mand, but also in the nature of things. In posi- 'tive institutions we are not authorized to reason 'what we should do, but implicitly to obey. In 'moral requirements, we are clearly shewn and 'commanded to perform certain duties, but left 'at liberty to reason, to know in what these duties 'consist.'* p. 46. 47.

If I understand the above distinctions, the sentiment of Mr. C. that positive commands, tell us plainly our duty, and the way in which that duty is to be discharged: but the precepts only mo-

* The above view proves, that Mr. C. had at least heard of the terms *moral* and *moral position.* It is a kind of miserable mixture of truth and error. It is said that Mahomed formed the Alcoran from the Jewish, Christian, and Pagan systems; therefore it had some truth in it.

ral, tell us in some kind of general terms the duty, but let each subject discharge it as he pleases. To give us an example of the way in which he understands the subject, he quotes a passage; Phil. 4. 8. 'Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things.'

Mr. C. certainly, and not the scriptures, is the first to whom we stand indebted for this *new revelation* of moral and positive precepts until his time, the christian world have been in the *dark* on the subject; but, like every other new theory, we cannot adopt it at once; and this, for the following reasons.

1st. The will of God revealed, is the rule of the subject's duty, and it matters not to us, how that is made known in the scriptures of truth, whither by vision, dreams, Balaam, Isaiah or the apostles. It is our duty to obey.

2nd. It matters not whether in express revelation, or by plain letters, our particular duty is made known. Mr C. would, indeed, have a very large bible that must expressly tell every individual his or her duty, in particular; for as the same may not be learned by inference, when it is required by the positive moral law, the command must contain the name and sirname of the individual, upon whom the duty is enjoined. If indeed God appoints a positive institution for the benefit of the church, I may easily and by a natural process of reasoning learn that the same is my duty; but this I find by exercising my reason upon the command, yet this I must not do, if I adopt Mr. C's system; for thereby, I will destroy all positive in-

stitutions. They, according to his system, may be moral, but not positive when found by any process of reasoning. e. g. A person applies to Mr. C. for baptism; he makes a full profession of his faith; Mr. C. asks the scriptures for his duty; he finds examples of adults being baptized, of different ages; he finds Christ giving a command to ministers to go and baptize; but, from the begining of Genesis to the last of the book of the Revelation, he finds no such passage, as according to his system, he now needs. These must be the words of the passage. 'Alexander Cambell, V. D. M. go take this man (naming him) and plunge him into Buffaloe, Chartiers or Short Creek,' (as conveniency may serve, for, to make the passage express, it must contain the name of the creek.)—Without much inference Mr. C. can now go to work. But the misfortune is there is no such passage, and of course, on his scheme there cannot now be any positive institution. They must be founded upon some 'express precept of the Deity.'

3rd. It is an unfair division of the moral law; because it supposes, that, upon some of its precepts, you may exercise your reason, in order to find your duty; and another class of them, upon which reason must not be exercised, without destroying the institution altogether. I fear this division will hardly be admitted by readers of common sense; because they will immediately reply, that one class of moral precepts were made for reasonable men, and another class for people without reason.

Lastly, I object to Mr. C's. system of the moral law, for another very important reason. It has no foundation in scripture. He cannot even prove

it by inference; for then we should have admitted it.

We are now constrained to adhere to the *old* system of *morals*; which we shall briefly state, in answer to one question. 'What is the duty which 'God requireth of man? The duty which God 'requireth of man is obedience to his revealed will? short, cat. quest. 39. This is intended to comprehend the whole duty of man. If the will of God, even by the most diligent search can be found, our duty of course follows.

If this doctrine be not true, then the following things must be true.

1st. That reason, in some sense, is a law; that is, in those cases were the divine law, fails in clear revelation, D. Hume and T. Pain, and I was going to say M—would agree with this, because it strikes at the first root of divine revelation.

2nd. There must be as many different laws as there are subjects of law; because two individuals never reason in the same precise way; and with all that variety of reasoning, the conduct of each, will be morally right, although very distinct, and in many cases, directly opposite.

3rd. That in order to obtain a knowledge of the moral law, difficult search must be made in order to discover our duty; but no such search is necessary, where we enquire for our duty, as required by laws positively moral.

Now because we refuse the doctrines contained in these assertions, and yet admit the truth of the assertion, that there is a distinction between precepts, naturally moral, and those positively so; we ask for the distinction. I answer, that those commands which are founded solely upon the will of God, are positive; and those which, in their na-

ture, are unchangeable, & being founded upon the divine nature are naturally moral. To the first class belonged, I grant, the prohibition to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, in the cerimonial and judicial laws; to this same class also belong the commands of Baptism and the Lord's supper, while to the latter belong the ten commandments, with the exception of a part of the fourth commandment, which respects the precise portion of time to be devoted to the Lord; together with all those commands throughout the scriptures, which are in their nature unchangeable.

By inference or otherwise our duty from all these commands is found; they all require perfect obedience, which we have neither will or power to render. From the darkness of our minds, but not from any defect in the divine law, we disagree respecting our duty; even in our practice, we cannot 'see eye to eye.' Mr. C. is perhaps the first christian writer who has charged these defects on the law of God.

The way by which we learn the divine mind, is by inference, &c. but nothing on this subject is to be decided, by the commands being positively, or naturally moral; in either, with the same ease or difficulty we learn our duty. Sometimes our duty is mentioned in general terms, as in Phil. 4. 8. The passage quoted by Mr. C. or in Micah, 6. 8. 'He hath shewed thee O man what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.' But the same duties, are in other parts particularly mentioned; and this in language, generally so plain that 'he that runs may read.'

Upon Mr. C's. view of the subject, the greatest

part of practical duties must cease to be. Where is the express warrant for the change of the sabath? This belongs to the positive part of the fourth commandment. If Mr. C. will adhere to the positive injunctions on this subject, he must either turn Jew, or seven day baptist; where is the express warrant for family worship? Not in the scriptures, nay, even secret prayer fares the same fate; unless a man is wealthy enough to own a closet; for, in the express warrant requiring this subject, they were told to enter into a closet. Preaching, and almost every duty by Mr. C's. *sweeping* system, is annihilated. In this he will be contadicted by the experience of all God's people; loose and profane gospel hearers, will become his disciples, without undergoing any change. It is nature's system he teaches.

Moral precepts would receive no force had the revelation even been made on Mr. C's plan. The commandment given in Math. 7. 12. 'Therefore all things, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' This is a re-relation, as expressly prohibiting slavery, as if the command had run in these express words, no man or woman (naming them) shall make trafic of his fellow men.

Having thus premised a few things, and having called the attention of the reader to Mr. C's. absurd theory, upon which he builds his system; we shall prosecuted the subject in debate

That baptism, is itself, literally required, and expressly commanded, is not denied by Mr. C. From example, command, and the nature of the duty, we learn the persons to be baptised. But, because he cannot find these express words *thou shalt baptize infants*; he refuses to do it, and

although even this revelation had been made, he would have been under the necessity of reasoning from a general command, to a particular duty, and this, according to his theory, would not have done. 'In positive institutions we are not autho-'rized to reason what we should do.' Nay, the very age of the children must be mentioned. They must be under ten or fifteen years. So from the reasoning before, a slave holder justifies the nefarious practice of slavery, because, they can find no express warrant against it, seven day baptists can find no express warrant for the change of the sabbath; and even some refuse to read any other book than the Bible, because we are commanded to search the scriptures, but not commanded to search any other book. I suppose the church of Corinth, was at as great a loss to find the proper manner of celebrating the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as Mr. C. is to find the proper subjects and mode of baptism; and therefore, encouraged drunkenness and gluttony, in this sacred feast. Christ corrected this mistake by Paul, not by any new revelation, but by repeating the revelation made at the institution.

We have Mr. C. making an assertion as if it had been asserted by a Pedo-Baptist, 'a positive institution as founded wholy upon reason.' I reply, that no Pedo-Baptist will say so; we say that no duty whatever is founded upon reason. The divine law stands ready to condemn or approbate every act performed by man. Reason, in no case, is a bar at which human actions will be tried. It may be laid down as a general assertion in no case to be contradicted; that every ordinance, nay, every justifiable act, is founded solely upon the divine law, whether the true meaning of the

law is to be discovered, by its express letter, by inference, or example.

Before I further attend to his objections, I would observe, that is an evident trait in Mr. C's character as a disputant, that those who were not present at the public debate, should know; this was evident in the debate, and is manifest in his book: that whenever he received an agument for which he had no reply at hand, he attempted to look the argument out of countenance. He would treat it with the greatest possible contempt; and upon that occasion vociferate and declaim unusually. He would give an excellent character to his own argument, thereby attempting to pass it, with those who had implicit faith in all he said, the argument passed decently, but with those who possessed sense, it was treated with contempt.

We have a striking example of this in his rearoning on positive institutions. It had been observed by Pedo-Baptist writers, that there was no express warrant for female communion, and the arguments offered by Mr. Edwards and others, on this subject, never yet have received a reply. Mr. C. must now attempt it. Now reader attend to his strong and convincing reply. 'As to his second query concerning female communion, I 'have to observe, that although sundry Pedo-'Baptists have made a salvo, to soothe their minds 'in this apparent difficulty; it is a poor and pitiful come off. It is the most puerile and childish 'retort, that I ever heard used by adults, that had 'any knowledge of words and things.' P. 70. 71.*

*This argument or rather mode of reply, for I suppose Mr. C. intends it for both, is a complete *campbelism*. It was evident to an enlightened

Mr. C. would now have dropped the subject with this noble reply, but something must be said, was 'the Lord's supper, instituted or appointed to men, 'or women,' as such? Was it not appointed to 'the disciples of Christ? he gave it to the disciples saying partake ye all of it.' The truth of the doctrine, that women should be admitted to a communion table, no person disputes. In this we agree with Mr. C. But the question is, what is his express warrant? Thou shalt admit women (naming them) to a communion table? or let a woman so examine herself and so let her eat. No, these are not to be found. He would have prefered such passages.

But Christ gave the elements to his disciples; of the bread he said: Eat ye all of it; of the wine drink ye all of it.' This is true, but were there any women among the disciples? answer No. Then how is the warrant of female communion found here? Mr. C. has an answer at hand: thirty or forty years after the institution of the supper, a woman is called a disciple. I am now prepared to infer with him that a woman, may be admitted to the sacrament of the supper. Should I found my argument for the communion of men, upon the fact to which Mr. C. alludes, I can establish it by easy inference; but the circumstance of men being the only communicants at that time, makes the inference for the admission of women lay more

---

audience, and must be so now to the reader, that he could not do any thing with the reply on this subject. Mr. C. is well acquainted with the ignorance of this day, and intends to profit by it; had he consulted his duty, he would rather tried to have enlightened them.

remote. We shall however attempt to find it.

Every disciple of Christ, may be admitted to a communion table.

But women are called disciples of Christ: therefore women may be admitted to a communion table.

Mr. C. thinks this inference so easy, that at least we should take it for an express warrant. But in reviewing the sylogism, I find it not true. I find a defect in the first term, it is too general, I shall therefore amend it.

Every disciple of Christ may not be admitted to a communion table, because they may be overtaken in a fault, and for some time, be under the influence of the sin, and as Miriam was, excluded for a season from the visible communion of the church.

But women are disciples of Christ: therefore women may be excluded from the communion of the church.

This last syllogism I know, is not very good. But it proves this, that it takes some reasoning to find a just inference: it is not a truth, that because they are disciples of Christ, that, therefore, they have always a right to communion. It takes some reasoning to find, that they are of that kind of disciples, that should be admitted to a communion table. Thus by reasoning and inference, I grant that it may be proved, that women have a right to be admitted to the full communion of the church.

Mr. C. saw what Mr. Edwards had done with Mr. Boothe's express warrants, and thought he should escape by inventing a new example, and thus be prepared for a new conclusion. But it is now found that his premise will not necessarily admit of his conclusion. A person in *delerium* may

be a disciple of Christ; and this, in addition to the above, can shew the fallacy of his argument, that, because a person is a disciple of Christ, that therefore they must be admitted to a communion table. Mr. C. will have to exert his inventive powers once more, and again declaim at some length, before he will produce an express warrant for female communion.

Mr. C. gives us a new comment upon acts 2. 23. 'For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' The promise he supposes to which Peter refers, is cited from Joel v. 17, 18, 19 20. Page 56. 57, and according to his usual manner declares that he 'that saith he can-'not see it is blind indeed,' page 56.

By the things promised in this verse, quoted by Peter, Mr. C must either understand the extraordinary manifestation of the spirit, as manifested on the day of Penticost, or the special exercise of the same spirit, in the work of grace. But it is impossible that it can be the former; for the promise to which Peter refers, was not only addressed to those present on that occasion, but to their children; to those who were yet heathen, or unborn, 'afar off.' But few of the *children*, or those *afar off*, ever witnessed these miraculous out-pourings of the spirit; and, of course, could not be the subjects of this particular promise. But the prophecy of Joel had a proper accomplishment on the day of Penticost; and therefore, the promise mentioned by Peter, could not, as Mr C. supposes, refer to the prophecy of Joel.

Mr. C. manages his comment on Peter's words as he does his other opponents; he says Peter had a reference to the prophecy made by Joel; and

the reason he gives must be sufficient. This is his strong argument—HE THAT CANNOT SEE IT, IS BLIND INDEED. This, however, is his usual mode of speech, when he either does not understand a point, or does not believe his own assertion.

Mr. C. next entertains you, with an attempted refutation, of an argument drawn in favor of infant baptism, from the circumstances of a number of households being baptized. Page 72, 73. After taking a view of the household of Cornelius, mentioned in the 10th chap. of Acts, he concludes; 'The imaginary infants of the household of Cor-'nelius when the 10th chapter of the Acts is read, 'come out distinguished believers and notable 'christians.' The acuteness of Mr. C's genius has made some discoveries on this chapter which no other person can see. We cannot perceive any thing in the chapter which excludes the possibility of infant members being in it. Should I make this public declaration respecting a family, that they were religious; had instructive parents; a household that feared God; would any one challange me for speaking improperly, although some of them were infants, and some sufficiently grown to yield the fruits of religious education? But Luke asserts no more respecting the household of Cornelius, Acts 10, 2. 'A devout man and one that feared God, with all his house;' and finally that they were baptized.

2nd. Household, was the household of Lydia. 'The 40th verse prohibits the supposition of in-'fants, for we are told that Paul, at her request, 'after he was discharged from prison, visited her 'family; and that 'when they had entered the 'house of Lydia & had seen the brethren, and com-'forted them, they departed.' So that these sup-

'posed that infants were brethren in the faith, 'capable of receiving comfort from the words of 'the apostle.'

Reader, attend to this new species of household. It was composed of the neighbors who had called to visit her family, and hear Paul preach. These were all baptized. Paul and Silas, who also had called with her, were thereby constituted a part of her household; and of course, with the rest were baptized. It is not possible that any person can believe Mr. C's doctrine. That if a number of neighbours, either accidentally or by design, happened to meet in the house of a neighbor, that they thereby constituted *one household.* But his idea is still more ridiculous, because a congregation, it appears, had collected at the house of Lydia; although they had no concern in her secular affairs, yet from this simple circumstance, according to Mr. C. they were the members of her household, and as such, obtained baptism. Any thing, Mr. C. rather than the baptism of Infants.

Whether Lydia was a widow, or had a living husband. I cannot tell; but I am certain she had a family. She not only had a house, but also a household; & this family, whether babes or not, were baptized. Mr. C. has found, (I suppose from Mr. Robison) that she was a travelling merchant; because it is said she was of the city of Thyatyra; and from this circumstance, would have the reader to believe that she was a single lady, that merely called at Philippi to sell a cargo of goods. He indeed talks so familiarly about it, that the reader would suppose he was personally acquainted with her. But she had a house, a suitable place of entertainment. This I confess does not appear much like a 'travelling merchant.' She had origi-

nally, lived in Thyatyra. She now resided in Philippi. Mr. C. you should at least try to make the likeness of truth.

The next example mentioned, is the household of the jailor, page 73. After Mr. C. reviews this subject, he concludes, 'So that the supposed in-'fants of this hou e were capable of having a ser-'mon preached to them, of believing,' &c. But the examination of the premises, will, perhaps render Mr. C's conclusion not so easy. Let us now read the passage. 'And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his straight-way. And when he had brought them into his house he sat meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.' Acts 16. To whom was the word here spoken? It is to the jailor, and to all that were in his house; including, perhaps, servants and others. Suppose that these were adults, as Mr. C. supposes. Yet these by the inspired historian, are carefully distinguished from the infants and other members of the family. Because, when he speaks of baptizing, it is the jailor 'and all his.' Mr. C. intentionally confounds those who heard the word, with those that were baptized; but Luke does not.

Mr. C. supposes that they were all triumphant believers who were baptized in his household. Here, as usual, Mr. C. takes the advantage of the reader not acquainted with the original text. Because the words 'rejoiced, believing,' are in the singular number, and therefore cannot include those to whom the word was preached*. He rejoiced

*There is but little doubt, but Mr. C. knew

with all his house; or rejoiced over that family, he had just dedicated to the Lord by baptism. Neither the joy of the family nor yet the joy of others is mentioned. The family had just now received the ordinance of baptism; why did they not join with their father in this joy? or why does the inspired historian, mention the joy of the father alone? The answer is easy; a great share of the family were children, too young to have an understanding of the seal, they had just received.

The last household mentioned by Mr. C. is the household of Stephanus. 1 Cor. 1. 16. He says that 'all the members of this household, were saints of the first magnitude; because they addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. Liberality is, indeed, an excellent character; but before Mr. C. I never heard that it constitutes a person; a saint of the first magnitude.' The truth, however, is, that the apostle gives a good character of this family; they were liberal in entertaining saints. But Mr. C. thinks that no family could be said to be liberal, who had infants; for this is the only reason he gives, why they could have no infant members in the family. 'They ministered to the saints.' His most ignorant readers can judge of the force of this argument.

Notwithstanding all Mr C. has said, the ar-

---

this fact. This circumstance might awaken his few disciples, when they see the use he makes of Greek. This is, however, to be observed, that Mr. C. always speaks with the most confidence, and exults most in victory, when he knows he is wrong. Tuis may do with one class of mankind, but the wise will scorn it.

gument of Pedo-Baptist, founded upon the facts of so many households being baptized, remains unimpaired. When this seal of the covenant of grace was first administered, under another form, the names of some of the infants, members of the household, were mentioned; nay at eight days old this seal was administered; of which we have a particular account given, when this positive institution was first mentioned; Gen. 17. 27. As the mode was the almost only thing changed, it appeared no longer necessary to mention the precise age of the different members of households admitted by this seal.

But the simple and natural method in which we find the baptism of households stated, form a strong argument in favor of the system of Pedo-Baptist. Mr. C. desires to amend the texts by inserting the adult members; this would end the controversy; but a reader of common sense, when he finds the word *household*, will at least suppose it probable, there were infant members in it. The household of Abraham is mentioned; we know it had infant members; yet the baptist deny that any infants belonged to the households of Lydia, Stephanus, &c. for this strong reason, that none of them are mentioned.

Next, Mr. C. objects to the interpretation given by Mr. W. of Psal. 127. Let us hear Mr. C. 'Now what a perversion of a plain portion of 'scripture, to attempt to shew, from these words, 'that infants are, in a spiritual sense, the inheri-'tance of the Lord, or a reward, or gift, presented 'to him by their parents This is just the reverse 'of the meaning of the Psalm' He accordingly presents us with a paraphrase, lest we should misunderstand the passage. 'Lo,' even children

'themselves, which are born by ordinary genera-
'tion, are an heritage or gift of the Lord to pa-
'rents, and the fruit of the womb is his reward to them.' P. 74. But we ask to whom is the address made? We answer, to parents; and those believers, having a standing in the covenant of grace; and it is to them, an intimation, that they may enjoy themselves without inquietude. They may consider themselves delivered from all the anxieties and troubles of the world, manifested by their rising early and sitting up late from rest; feeding on the bread of sorrow, &c. Because you are taken into a relation to God, by which you have peace with God secured, and finally, a conquest over the world. As the persons addressed are believers, so the heritage of which the Psalmist speaks, is believer's children. These God declares to be his heritage; and while they are only lent to parents, the right of the Head of the Church is not thereby relinquished. All we ask is, that this heritage should be sealed to the Lord, by baptism.

Mr. W. did, in the public dispute, and does yet, contend, that the passage in Psal. 127, does declare, that infants may be constituted members of the visible church, by declaring, that the children of believers are the 'heritage of the Lord.' This is a title in scripture given to the church, Joel 2. 17. 'Spare thy people O Lord, and give not thy heritage to reproach.' The church is an heritage which Christ 'purchased of old.' It will indeed take the ingenuity of Mr. C. to prove that the expression in Psal. 127, must mean something different from that which it was, in every other part of scripture.

The next argument he attempts to refute, is

drawn from Matt. 28. 19. 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' P. 151. Mr. C. after profoundly trying his Greek skill, Succeeds in proving that the word THEM, does not relate to nations; but only to those parts of nations, that are discipled. This, indeed, may serve him for an opportunity of displaying himself; because no person ever denied that which he has proven; and therefore, his Grecian labor is lost. No person ever supposed that Christ's injunction required the baptism of every person, prophane or sober. But this inference will not be denied, even by the Baptists, that it is the duty of Gospel ministers to go and preach the Gospel to different nations, and give such as receive it the seals of the covenant of grace. Yet we observe that something more is found in this expression of Christ. From the injunction of Christ in Matt. 28. 19. the following things are evident.

1st That an adult should be taught by the preaching of the everlasting Gospel, before he be baptized.

2 d. That it was the duty of all the nations to whom the apostles came, to receive the word of life to them preached, and the sacrament of baptism to them presented

3rd. That every member constituting the nation, whether male or female, bond or free, young or old, should profit, by the administration of word and sacrament. It will be granted, that the parents were not the only persons bound to receive these; but their children also. The parents being once instructed and initiated in the mysteries of grace, were qualified and disposed to instruct their children; who, like olive

plants, might be set around their Gospel table, and reap the fruit of all the blessings their parents possessed.

4th. That all who were in the nation, and capable of being taught, should be instructed. And again, all who were capable of being baptized should receive this ordinance. But as receiving instruction, supposes the activity of the subject instructed; so none but those capable of understanding could receive instruction. But in the receiving of the sacrament of baptism, no activity was necessary; then the infant members of the nation could be the proper subjects of it. The fit subjects of baptism were then more numerous, than the fit subjects addressed in the ministry; because baptism included adults and infants. But as Mr. C. is fond of syllogisms, he shall have it in that form.

If infants are the members of a nation, they were included in the positive command of Christ. Matt. 28. 19.

But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

Our first assertion will not be denied. The second I think is a natural consequence. Mr. C. thinks not. Why? because the words might be rendered go ye therefore into all the world and disciple all nations; and because infants cannot be discipled they must not be baptized. But I observe, that Mr. C's. inference is not true. Read Math. 10. 42. 'And whosoever shall give to drink, unto one of these little ones, a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise loose his reward.' There, a *little one, a babe*, is called a disciple. But a certain Dr. Lathrop, who happened to quote, for some purpose, Matt. 18. 5, 6. Mr. C. to the surprise of

the Doctor, found the words *little one* in v. 6, were to be understood of believers; and then he abuses the Doctor for daring to think that the words *little one* could mean a babe. The amount of Mr. C's. reasoning is, that the words *little one* were taken in a figurative sense in Matth. 18. 6. Therefore, this must be their signification in every other scripture passage.

Mr. C. admits that infants may, in infancy, receive a seal of civil citizenship, even at eight days old; although they are both unconscious of the sign and of the thing signified. Granting circumcision to be, what Mr. C. supposes, a national sign, a seal of the earthly Canaan, yet it will not be denied that it was an instructive seal. They must, according to him, have by it, been taught their national character, their civil rights and priviledges, their security for possessing their land, and finally, the source from which all flowed. Why, Mr. C do all this to male infants, when they had no understanding of any of the doctrines taught in this rite? But this was in a civil sense, discipling them; and as we have before shewn, has all the Baptist difficulties attached to it, that discipling them in a religious sense could have.

'But the commission of Christ says, first teach 'and then Baptize.' Page 152. I reply that Christ, upon issuing the commission, mentioned in Mark 26. 16. continues: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned' Now, upon Mr C's. plan, I argue. He that will not believe, shall not be saved, but no infant in a state of infancy will believe; therefore, no infant dying in a state of infancy will be saved. The truth of my conclusion drawn on his plan, is evident; because faith is set before salvation; and

of course, without faith, salvation cannot follow. Nor will any person either believe Mr. C's premises, or are they prepared to receive his conclusion.

Thus from scripture and reason, I think the impartial reader will say, that the doctrine of infant baptism is established. Indeed the reader will acknowledge, that little more was necessary after the establishment of the first propositions. Mr. C. was well aware of this, and therefore plead with all the ingenuity of which he was master, with all the sternness which he possessed, and with all the pity which a *falling combatant* could claim, that Mr. W. would let him loose from the old *musty* covenant, and from the doctrine of circumcision, here indeed his cause looked miserable. Here was the mortal disease of his system, Mr. C. felt it. When the discussion of this was done, little more was necessary.

In order that his system should live, the covenant of the Old testament, the church in that day, nay even the gospel of that age, must all die, they must be no more; and the language of a Paine, a Hume, a Bolingbroke must be revived, to bring down scorn and contempt, upon that age, that Mr. C. may succeed in establishing his theory, and lead captive unthoughtful, and ignorant hearers.*

* Perhaps the degeneracy of a part of our community cannot be better discovered, than by the support which a periodical work, edited by Mr. C. receives. The loose, and I think, the prophane manner with which he treats divine revelation, must be shocking to the Christian ear. See his observations on Prov. 27, 27, and on Acts. 13, 23.

Mr. C. concludes his discussion of the doctrine of infant baptism, in a way, which must convince every attentive reader: that the ignorant and unwary are his mark, this he evidences.

1st. By his address to the Roman Catholicks, page 183. And here I may remark, that his address to the Papists and others, are drawn on the plan of Mr. Hume's history of England Mr. Hume because he was an infidel, gives no discriminating view of the different churches in Britain, but places on a *level*, the church of Rome, and the reformed churches. So Mr. C although he may not very well understand the different points, which distinguish the church of Rome from protestants, yet at least he is careless about it.

It is true, that in some sense the Papists are Pedo-Baptists, because they yet in some way, however corrupt, retain a few of the apostolical practices: but will the Baptists deny the being of a God, because the Roman Catholicks believe it? While even this doctrine is corrupted by them, in their worshipping of saints and angels; so the doctrine of infant baptism is corrupted by papists, by the sign of the cross, and other superstitious rites attached to it by them: yet we are willing to agree with them, so far as they recognize the doctrine of the Bible.

2nd By his address to the Episcopalians, his manner of writing to them, has rather a tendency to confirm them in every view he opposes. The serious members of that church, deplore all the abuses of this doctrine, and while to Mr. C. it is the subject of sport, yet to every honest Episcopalian, it is the subject of lamentation. It is usual with the prophane rabble, to take peculiar pleasure in dwelling upon the faults of professors of the Chris-

tion religion, forming thereby, some excuse for themselves. It is a pity to find Mr. C. copying their conduct, and presenting it to the world for their imitation. Among the Episcopalians, he only selects those members, who like himself, have denied their own baptism.

3rd. Respecting that which Mr. C. says of the Presbyterians, I shall make a few observations. He asserts in page 183 'For if, as their confession says, the sprinkled infant, 'is engrafted into 'Christ' by sprinkling, then its sins must be for-'given it; then it must be pardoned and accepted.' It is quite sufficient here to reply, that neither such expressions, nor sentiments are found in a confession of faith, belonging to any branch of the Presbyterian church, and is one of Mr. C's usual comments. Mr. C. has soon forgotten his shorter catechism, when in a citation made from that small book, he can be contradicted by every school boy. 'By it, the church of Rome secures 'all born within her dominion, the church of En-'gland and the church of Scotland, secure, by this 'rite, all within the pale of their respective juris-'dictions, each sect has its own views' Page 183. If Mr. C. here means that parents, who have presented their children to God in baptism, teach their respective views to their children, then I grant that children generally possess the sentiments of their parents; but I have never yet been able to discover a difference in this respect, between the children of Baptists and Pedo Baptists. Nay, I have known some, who undergo all the changes of their parents, and with them leap from creed to creed. Will Mr. C. advise parents to teach their children views, they believe not. Query, how does he teach his own children?

But why attribute that to baptism, which belongs to the manner of teaching alone? The Roman Catholick is as strongly attached to his particular views as Mr. C. is, he teaches his children to hate the doctrine of the protestants, with the same partiality, that Mr. C. would teach his, to hate the doctrine of Pedo Baptists. The consequence is, that children of the one, become Roman Catholicks, and the children of the other, some kind of Baptists. This phenomenon is by Mr. C. ascribed to infant baptism.*

But every reasonable reader, will refuse his conclusion, because the principle is not contained in the premises, the effects not found in the cause.

Mr. C. not content with charging almost every

* The reader will pardon me, for paying any attention to Mr. C's observations on other branches of the church. These remarks have generally their answer in themselves. I should have paid no attention to that which he has said, but for the sake of a certain class of readers. There are some, who easily take offence at the church of Christ, to us all, infidelity is natural, while Thomas Pain and others, proclaimed war against the scriptures, attempting thereby to disarm the church. Mr. C. is not willing fully to declare on their side; but while he almost concedes their views with respect to the Old testament, he attacts the church in another quarter viz. her practice, doctrine, and profession, with a few he may succeed, but with the wary and discerning he never will. Those who feel little interest in Divine truth, or vital piety, will content themselves, notwithstanding of all that has been said, with a superficial view of the subject.

error and outrage upon truth, upon Pedo-Baptism; but interwoven in its being, he finds persecution with all its horrors, on this he reasons as fairly, as I would do, should I assert that adult baptism, was the cause of the basest crime committed by men, the betraying of the son of God, it was done by Judas, an adult subject of baptism and one indeed thought by Mr. C. to have been dipped. On the other hand the baptists were a sanctified people from the begining. That such was the character of the baptists, let readers judge for themselves, like other branches of the church, they have had their faults. Let us hear the facts from a German writer of the age, in which the baptists arose. Mr. Hoorne, page 318 319. Whether he was a Pedo-Baptist, or not, I cannot say, yet certainly he was impartial. 'Their founders in Germany were 'Nicholas Storch and Thomas Muntzerus. They 'rejected Pedo-Baptism and taught that baptized 'infants should, when they became adults, be re-'baptized. That impious magistrates should be 'slain, and in their room pious princes and ma-'gistrates should be set up. They arose about 'the year 1525. They collected their troops and 'occupied Mulhusias a city in Thuringia; from 'which they led their army to indiscriminate butch-'ery, believing they should reign without a rivel, 'and would have left Germany a heap of ruins; 'but Philip, Ldangrave of Hesse seized their lea-'der, Muntzerus and took off his head, and set it 'upon a pole, in the centre of a public place, as a 'terror to others,* and dispersed the troops.' Muntzerus like Mr. C. had his own standard of

*This upon the whole, was rough treatment of one of Mr. C's holy baptists.

piety, and like him, he attempted to destroy every other system and set up one in its room: yet he succeeded better among the Germans in obtaining followers, than Mr. C. has among the Americans. That was the age of popery, this is not.

It is evident, from any church history that mentions the events of that day, that Mr. C. might, with more propriety, have described the persecution, and the full spirit of it found in the church, to which he has the honor of belonging, more than in any branch of the protestant church. Every impartial historian justifies the conduct of the celebrated Knox, and many, the conduct of Calvin, in those events for which Mr. C. condemns them: but none the conduct of the baptists. In justice to this branch of the church, we must, however observe, that no more of a persecuting spirit is now found among them than in other branches of the church; nor would any of their writers, treated this subject as Mr. C. has done, I do not believe, that the conduct of these ancient Ana-baptists, proceded from their views of baptism, nor do I believe that the persecuting spirit of the baptists arose from their views of baptism: every impartial reader will equally deny both.

We shall next attend to the history of baptism. But before we proceed to give a particular history we shall make a few observations.

1st. Mr. C. refuses the testimony of any person with respect to facts, who does not agree with him in opinion. Upon this general view of the subject, and as if there could be no controversy on this point, he proceeds to invalidate the testimony of Cyprian and others, because their views, not on facts, but on abstract subjects, differed from his: yet he never once attempted to impeach

the character of any of the fathers, on *truth* and *veracity*.

2nd. This position, must therefore be true, that no witness can be received in a civil court to give testimony, whose religious sentiments may differ, from the Judge before whom he testifies: what are your religious sentiments? must be the first question asked to every witness, who appears before court. Query, will ever the world be reduced to that state of ignorance. It was the popish opinion in the 13, 14, and 15 centuries, Mr. C. has revived it.

3rd. Many of the fathers, I grant, were in the habit of calling baptism *regeneration*, although this manner of speech, is not to be justified, yet it is not probable, that their sentiments differed much on this subject, from those now generally believed, by both *regular* baptists and Pedo-Baptists. It was evidently a practice of the Old-testament saints, to call circumcision a covenant; while it was only a seal of a covenant, as in Gen. 17. 13. So the fathers might have called baptism, *regeneration* because baptism is the sign of it. Had this been true however, their testimony on facts might have been neverless true. It is remarkable that Mr. Robertson, believed to be a Socinian writer, was fully qualified, with Mr. C. to bear testimony, while the pious—or as he is usually styled the holy Cyprian, was refused. On this subject Mr. C's. readers will pity him.

In the history of infant baptism* we have a few

---

*I have for myself translated the most of the following quotations from the original works, or extracts of the same, found in the Lattin edition of Bingham's antiquities. I thought on this plan,

remaining sketches, or rather scraps of those fathers who were cotemporary with the apostles; by comparing their testimony, I think it will easily be infered, that infant baptism was preached in their day. Clemens Romanus and Hermes the shepherd, lived in those days; whether they were the persons, of whom the Apostle spake, I cannot affirm;* yet certainly they were the immediate successors of the apostles. That both these writers, granted the possibility of the salvation of infants will not be denied.

Clemens Romanus says in his epistle to the Corinthians. 'Job was just and without fault, 'true, worshiping God, abstaining from every evil. 'No one is free from corruption (*rhupou*) although 'he is but a day old (*oude ei mias hemeras he zoe autou,*)

Now reader attend to the testimony of the cotemporary writer of Clemens and see the importance attached by Hermes the shepherd to baptism. 'It is necessary, as by water, they have to 'ascend, that they may rest; for they cannot other-'wise enter into the kingdom of God, than by lay-'ing aside the mortality of this present life. They, 'therefore being sealed with the seal of the Son 'of God, and being dead, enter into the kingdom 'of the Son of God. For before a person receives 'the name of the son of God, he is destined to

---

that I could at least, do more justice to the facts, than if I had taken them, as found in English books.

---

*From the positive manner in which Mr. C. speaks of these fathers, you would think he was personally acquainted with them.

'death; but where he receives that sign, he is 'freed from death, and is delivered to life. But 'they ascend being sealed to life. To these there- 'fore is this seal preached, and they use it that 'they may enter into the kingdom of God.' Pas. lib. lib. 1. vis. 3. chap. 3.

Compare these declarations, and what is the evident result. That there could be no salvation to infants without baptism. For if as Clement says, they had moral corruption from the womb, and as Herms says, baptism the only way by which they could enter into heaven. It follows that such as desired the salvation of their children, would have this seal administered. Now although we grant that they attached an undue importance to this ordinance, yet it affects not the point upon which we demand their testimony. To every impartial reader, they declare, that infants at that time were baptized.

Justin Martyr who wrote about the year 148. has this declaration. 'There are many among us 'of each sex, sixty or seventy years old, who were 'made disciples of Christ when children (*hoi ek 'paidon ematuthesan to Christo.*') Those of whom Justin here speaks, were of course, initiated into the church during the life time of some of the apostles. But in the same apology, like Hermes, he declares the necessity of baptism for salvation and this he attempts to establish from John 3. 3, 5. But that he also granted the doctrine of original sin, is evident from some passages in his dialogue P. 315,316. That Justin viewed baptism, as coming in the room of circumcision, and thereby, granted the baptism of infants, is also evident. 'We,' says he 'have not received 'that circumcion according to the flesh, but in a

'spiritual manner, as Enoch and the like (oi 'omoioi) saints received it; but we have receiv-'ed it by baptism: seeing we as sinners, are re-'ceived by the mercy of God, and are all free in 'like manner. old copy P 261.

But Mr. C. having faithfully mutilated Mr. W's. quotation, P. 105, 106. says 'There is not then, I affirm the slightest ground, to quote Justin Martyr 'as a testimony in favor of infant baptism.'*

Let the reader now judge for himself If it be conceded that baptism is to the subject now, that which, circumcision was to its subjects under the Old testament, then infants may be baptized. But this concession is absolutely made by Justin Martyr, or otherwise his words can have no meaning. Had Mr. C. made the same concession with this father, he never would have denied the doctrine of infant baptism. But it is also evident from the same writer that he did not think, with Mr. C. that the priviledges of New testament parents were abridged, those now 60 or 70 years old were disciples to Christ when children. So the

*The reader will look at a note in Mr. C's book, P. 105. The last and first assertions of that note are equally true. Indeed Mr. W. does think, that the books assigned to 'the list of Mr. C's. saints—such as SAINT Barnabas SAINT Hermes, &c. were never seen by those SAINTS Their theology differs very much, from that which would have been written by the companions of the apostles—one of whom was an evangelist before the Apostle Paul, the style savors more of the 4th, than of the 1st. century. Mr. C. knows this, but it serves his purpose, to hand forth spurious works, for genuine.

Jews had them discipled when eight days old by circumcision, this is the opinion of Justin Martyr, but not of Mr. C.

It appears to have been an opinion generally received, in the time of Justin Martyr, that the ordinance of baptism, was essential to salvation: without doubt, at that period, they would have their children baptised. The homilies supposed to have been written by Clement Romanus* has this question, 'of what use is the water of bap-'tism in the worship of God? He answers, 1st. 'It pleases God in that it fulfills his will. 2nd. 'Because being regenerated by water and renew-'ed by God, the weakness of our nativity, which 'was produced by man, is removed; so that final-'ly you can enter into life but otherwise it is im-possible,' (*allos de adunaton.* 26. P 698.

Let us next attend to the testimony of Ireneus. It indeed, appears something difficult to fix precissely the time of the birth of this celebrated man. Mr. Dodwell that writes a dissertation on his age, has fixed it A. N. 97 this he collects from an expression of Ireneus, 'the fall of the empire of 'Domition happened in his time.' But Mr. Bingham states that another copy, has it 'almost at 'his time.' Yet certain it is that he was born before the year 122, while as yet Polycarp the dis-

* I have more reason for supposing Clement, was the author of these homilies, than Mr. C. has for, supposing that his SAINT Barnabas was the author of the Catholick Epistle ascribed to him; yet I am far from being convinced that Clement was their author, although I believe the work to be very ancient and probably written about the time of Justin Martyr.

ciple of John the Divine was living, whom Ireneus declares he saw and heard preach, his testimony should be of force on this question, were infant children admitted, by baptism, members of the visible church in that age? The sincerity of his assertions will not be disputed by any christian, he sealed with his blood, the doctrine he professed. He uses these words book 2nd. chap. 39. 'Christ came to save all by himself, all I say, 'who by him are regenerate unto God, both infants 'and little ones, young men & elder persons,' By the expression 'regenerate unto God.' he certainly meant baptized unto God, because he uniformly uses the words in this sense. Thus he says in book 1st chap. 19. 'Because 'to deny baptism which is our regeneration to 'God' (*eis theon anagennesees.*) He has also these words. 'When Christ give the command-'ment of regenerating into God, he said go and 'teach all nations.' &c.

Tertullian ordained the Bishop of Carthage, was born in the last part of the 3rd century. He expresses his mind clearly on this subject, as it respects the fact, that infants were baptized. I grant that upon the subject of baptism, he held some opinions entirely unjustifiable, and in some things almost as wild in his notions as Mr C. He was indeed rather opposed to the baptism of infants, or any unmarried person. He advises that in most cases it be delayed until after marriage; yet he opposed the baptism of infants, merely because they were unmarried. But he expressly declares that in case of necessity arrising from evident approach of death, their baptism should not be delayed. And this he does upon the authority of Christ's words John 3 5. 'Except a man be born

of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' See Tertullian on baptism chap. 18, 19.

Origin that was his cotemporary, & indeed earlier in the church than Tertullian, affords us ample testimony, both as it respects his own views, and the opinion of others in his age, several things stand much in his favor as a witness: he was born about the year 183 His father & grand father both professed christianity; and, being born himself within a little more than 100 years of the life-time of some of the apostles, he must have had a particular knowledge of the acts, practices, and views of the church, from the earliest ages of her New testament history. Leonidas, his father, suffered martyrdom in the persecution raised by Severus the Roman Emperor; at which time, Origin, who was only 18 years of age, wrote a letter to his father, to continue steadfast in his adherance to truth, to death. He says: 'The baptism of children are 'given for the forgiveness of their sins; but why 'are children, by the usage of the church, baptized, 'if they have nothing that wants forgiveness?' He adds: 'It is because, by baptism, the pollution 'of our birth is taken away, that infants are bap-'tized.' Nay, he asserts, that the practice was received from the apostles; he declares: 'The church 'had also an order from the apostles to give 'baptism to infants: for they to whom, the Divine 'mysteries were committed, knew that there was, 'in all persons, a natural pollution, which ought 'to be washed away, by water and the spirit.'

Cyprian and Ambrose declare, that it was the original practice of the church to baptize infants. I was even urged against Pelagius that he denied the doctrine of original sin, and yet he granted that

infants should be baptized. 'Men slander me,' says Pelagius, 'as if I denied baptism to infants.'

Thus, reader, I have given you a brief view of the testimony of the first New testament writers upon this subject; I think it remains evident, that the writers of the two first centuries, admitted the baptism of infants; and that it had been constantly practized in the church from the earliest ages of the New testament. There is not a single hint given, of adults possessing an exclusive right to this ordinance.

The false views of the church at that time, form a reason, why it is very improbable, that they would neglect the baptism of their children. It is conceded by all, that infants may be regenerated; but their expressions seem to say, that baptism was regeneration; it was not likely, with this opinion, they would neglect the ordinance. They held that baptism was essential to salvation; with this view would they neglect the administration of it to their children?

The primitive fathers, generally granted the doctrine of original sin. Pelagius was among the first who openly denied it; and therefore should have been among the first to deny infant baptism;* for without guilt, any atonement is unnecessary, or any sign to represent it.

The heresy of denying infant baptism, did not make its appearance, until the third century, when many other errors made their appearance, some of which Mr. C. mentions. He should have ad-

* I should think, that Mr. C. might feel hurt when he finds the heretical Pelagius considering it slander, to hold that which Mr. C. thinks is an honor. *O tempora. O mores.*

ded this opinion of the baptists to the list. That was the age of the novelty of sentiment. They began to deny infants a right to baptism. This is the reason why Cyprian, Austin, Chrysostim and others of the succeeding fathers, are so explicit on the subject of baptism.

The writers of the two first centuries have but little on the subject of baptism; became the right of children to that ordinance at that time, was not disputed. It fared with the subject, as with the doctrine of the Trinity, until the time of Arius, little was said on that subject; but, after his time, we have an abundance on the subject of the Trinity. The church is apt to assert a truth but feebly, until it is opposed; but opposition gives life to the testimony of the church.

Mr. C. by his despising the testimony of the early fathers, by his reviling their characters, concedes to the world, that their testimony lay against him. A man, who in court has a witness called, who testifies in his favor, will endeavor to establish the character of that witness. Had Mr. C. believed the witness of these fathers on his side, he would not have called forth the aid of a slandering Robinson, to calumniate them. No, he would have carefully concealed their failings. His ingenuity to impeach, is his ingenious confession, that all their testimony was in favor of Pedo baptism.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM *

We have now come to that part of the debate-

* If Mr C. has done Mr. W. little justice in the other part of the debate, he has done him still

for which Mr. C. expressed so much fondness during the debate. When, at any time, he either was exhausted himself, or had not filled up his time, he would fly to this subject, informing the audence that he would fill up the time as he pleased.* It must however be observed, that he never touched this part of the debate, with any thing like a true spirit of investigation. He spends a great share of his time, in praising Lexographers; no time in giving true the analysis of words. He sports much and does little on this point of debate.

It is not our intention hereto offer to the public any criticisms upon the Greek word, translated *to baptize.* Writers have done this to good purpose already. Mr. Ralston in a late publication, certainly has given a very just view of this part of the subject; and I think, has done justice to the Greek

less on the mode of baptism. In this part of the debate, he has Mr. W. giving some tolerable good criticisms on the Greek words: but some of these, however good, were never seen by Mr W. until he read them in Mr. C's book. Other criticisms Mr. W. did make; these Mr. C. has mutilated. Some of the arguments are entirely misrepresented, e. g those which were drawn from the typical atonement. You would suppose, that Mr. W. believed, that the water of baptism respected the ground of justification *alone*, which is not a fact.

* It is supposed Mr. C. did this to *pick* a quarrel with Mr. Findly, one of the Judges, because he knew that the Judges were bound to keep the disputants to the question. He missed his aim, necessity alone impelled Mr. F. to use this power.

words. But I observed, during the public debate, and I noticed the same in Mr. C's strictures on Mr. R's review, that he scarcely attempts to remove the difficulties, which stand in his way, from the meaning of the original words. I have observed the same thing, with most of the baptist writers. They have a beaten track in which they all travel; indeed some attempt it, who do not know the difference between the Greek and Dutch. And yet when Pedo Baptists attempt to shew that the word *baptize* is frequently used, both by heathen and sacred writers, when it cannot be translated, *to dip*, *to plunge*: and must mean to *sprinkle*, to *pour*, no reply is given, and frequently none attempted. I shall therefore, only for the present, briefly reason from the nature of the ordinance.

The only matter here in dispute, is, how much water is necessary in the administration of the ordinance of baptism? On this Pedo Baptists have had but little difficulty; because, from a drop to the fullness of the ocean, they do not object. It is sufficient that the element of water be used. Water is a sign; and until the baptists can shew, that the command which requires the use of this sign, specifies also the quantity to be used, we must regard all their reasoning as inconclusive.

The word *baptize*, in its fullest, supposed extent, can determine nothing in favor of the baptists. For, suppose it does mean plunging entirely under water; yet they cannot draw the conclusion, that baptism is not rightly administered, unless by plunging, because *deipnon*. the word used to point out the meal taken in the Lord's supper, means a full feast. But it is conceded, that the Lord's supper may be rightly celebrated, by eating a morsel of bread, and drinking a small quantity of

wine. The Corinthians, reproved by the apostle Paul in 1st. Cor. 11. Appear to have fallen into the same mistake in eating the Lord's supper, that the baptists have, with respect to baptism. They supposed that, because the word *deipnon* signified a full, meal, they therefore eat and drank heartily. So the baptists, because they suppose the word *baptize* means *plunging*, must therefore conclude that it cannot be baptism, unless the person is wholly put under water.

We argue 1st. That if sprinkling with the blood of sacrifices was sufficient to represent the cleansing efficacy of Christ's blood, then the sprinkling of water in baptism is sufficient.

But the former is true. And therefore the latter.

That this was the end proposed by the blood of sacrifices, is not denied. But the blood of Jesus, is, in scripture, called a fountain. Zach. 13. 1. 'In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness.' But this '*fountain*' was sufficiently represented, by sprinkling; and, in the use of it, required by the cerimonial law, the sign and the thing signified had their connexion shewn. Heb. 9. 19. 20. 'For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hysop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, this is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.'

Let us for the present, take it for truth, that, by the blood of sacrifices, nothing more was intended to be emblematically set forth, than the justifying righteousness of Christ; yet, by this act of God, the believer is perfectly washed from all le-

gal guilt; whereas, the washing of regeneration, signified in the sacrament of baptism, is but partial. Corruptions, moral pollution, remain even after regeneration. Therefore, according to Mr. C's. concession, the act of sprinkling blood, was a fit sign to represent the perfect, the entire washing of a believer; whereas, we only plead that water, used in baptism, signifies the renewing of the believer in part. But as the former was represented by sprinkling, so I say, may the latter also.

SECOND ARGUMENT.

If the *mode* of baptism, be distinct from its *being*, then it is not necessary to plunge the person entirely under water, in the administration of this sacrament.

But the former is true. And therefore the latter.

That the *mode* is distinct from its being, will appear, by observing, that the only thing essentially necessary to the being of the ordinance in its external administration, is the use of water; the name of the persons of the Trinity, the subject suitable, and the administrator duly authorised. Bread and wine were the elements used in the sacrament of the supper, but no baptist will say that it is essential to the being of the ordinance, that a person should sit at table, although Christ sat at it; that the bread should be unleavened, although the bread used in its first institution was unleavened; or that it should be administered after night in an upper chamber, although these were facts in its first institution.

Water is the sign used in baptism, but nothing can depend upon either its quality, or quantity;

because an ocean of pure water, cannot wash away a single stain, or remove a single corruption; it is only a sign. It is in vain for you, reader, to listen to a great and tedious process of Greek investigation, to prove that baptizing meant plunging, seeing that a drop of water is as truly a sign, as a river would be. This is the reason why neither Mr. C. nor any other baptist, can be brought to prove the necessity of dipping from the nature of the ordinance.

When the baptists have succeeded in proving (which they never yet have done) that John the Baptist and the disciples dipped, the utmost inference, will not effect the mode used by the Pedo Baptist. They will only, after all, infer, that plunging is a suitable method in warm climates; as if I should assert that sitting at the Lord's table was a suitable mode in receiving the ordinance of the supper, because Christ and his disciples sat at meat.

THIRD ARGUMENT.

If God will have mercy and not sacrifice, then sprinkling is sufficient in baptism.

But the former is true. And therefore the latter.

Our first assertion will not be denied. That our inference is just will appear, by considering, that no ordinance which God requires, will, in any respect, violate any of his precepts; but the sixth commandment, which forbids us to kill, must require 'us to use all lawful endeavours to preserve our own life, and the lives of others.' But a great many diseases, to which the human body is subject, and some seasons of the year, entirely forbid the use of the cold bath; & to administer it, is

the form required by the baptist church, would endanger the life of the subject,* whereas, in some climates, and to some constitutions, it would be agreeable, and wholesome. There is, however, nothing essentially belonging to this ordinance, but that which is equally suited to all. seasons, constitutions, and climates; because that the gospel of which it is a seal, is so adapted. To whatever country or climate, ministers were sent to preach, they were also to baptize.

I have thus in a few words, endeavoured to establish the assertion, that sprinkling water is sufficient in the administration of the sacrament of baptism. Although we grant that dipping is baptism, because the element of water is used, yet I object to dipping for the following reasons.

1st. Because it is unnecessary. Any water applied in the name of the Trinity by a person duly authorised, is sufficient; a drop is as truly emblematical as an ocean.

2d. Because it makes the ordinance to consist, not in the element of water, but in the quantity used, so that the subject is not baptised unless entirely put under water.

---

*Baptists will tell you that they never knew any person hurt by being dipped. I first dispute the truth of the assertion. I think contrary facts can be produced They mostly however neglect the ordinance until the season will admit. But the idea they wish to hold out, is rather that there is a kind of miraculous preservation of the subject. This will do with fanaticks. But I would inform the public that water used in this ordinance, will produce the same effect as at other times.

3rd. Because it argues great ignorance of the ordinance. It savors too much of the useless ceremonies attached to the ordinance of baptism in the darkness of popery. A baptist will contend as firmly for dipping in baptism, as a Catholic did, at that time, for the sign of a cross in the administration of this sacrament.

4th. It calls too much of the attention to the sign; nothing in the administration of this ordinance should even for a moment, divert the attention from the thing signified. If the subject be a babe, then the faith of the parent should be actively employed, in claiming the promise, made through them to their children. If the subject be an adult, he should exercise faith in the very act of receiving the ordinance; but his attention will certainly be called off, by a plunge in cold water.

To this view of the subject, however, Mr. C objects. To those arguments which are founded upon the original words, I do not propose to attend to. He knows, he feels, notwithstanding of all his *egotism* and boasting, that he was satisfied on this subject during the public debate.* But we shall attend to a few of his objections, which

*From the great threats of Mr. C. what he would do with his opponent, when he would come to this part of the depate, it was expected, he would at least, present something ingenious on this part of the subject; but all the learned gentlemen on the stage with whom I conversed, felt themselves extremely disappointed. We suspect his Greek skill, indeed, to be very deficient; although he has persuaded a number that he is a perfect adept in this, and almost every thing else.

he gave in reply, to that which he states were Mr. W's. speeches.

He says P. 140. 'I deny that baptism has a 'respect to the blood of sprinkling, but that it de-'notes the washing of regeneration and the renew-'ing of the Holy Ghost, and is emblematical of 'the burial and resurrection of Christ and of our 'death and burial with him unto sin, and of our 'resurrection with him to a new life.' Upon this I would observe:

1st. That the 'washing of regeneration,' is indeed the thing chiefly signified by the sign of water used in baptism; it is not however, the only thing. Justification, regeneration, and sanctification, although all distinct in their nature, yet have the same ground, the same foundation, the blood of Jesus. Hence being washed in this blood, is used to denote, not only the justification of a believer, but also that work of the spirit, by which the believer is finally perfected. Rev. 1, 5. 6. 'Unto him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God.' In this passage it is evident, that in every respect, in which we were stained and polluted with sin, the blood of Jesus has washed us from it.

2nd. It is only because the debt of the believer is paid by the death of Christ, that he can be regenerated, or sanctified. The washing of regeneration could have no existence without the shedding of that blood which is the washing of justification.

3rd. It follows that every emblematical representation of justification, is also a sign of the washing of regeneration, where the things signi-

fied are inseparably connected, so also must the signs be.

4th. That baptism does teach, the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, is conceded. But Mr. C. by this concession has yielded the point in dispute, because, beyond all doubt, this doctrine was taught by the typical blood that was sprinkled under the cerimonial law. Christ Jesus was 'the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world.' This death was prefigured by the shedding of the blood of beasts slain in sacrifice, this was sprinkled upon the people to intimate their interest in it. Now if sprinkling this blood upon the people was a sufficient representation of this death as Mr. C. concedes, why does he refuse sprinkling of water as a sufficient representation of the same thing.

Mr. C. endeavours to establish his mode of baptism from Rom. 6. 4, 6. 'Buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead, by the Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' P. 140, 208 * For the proper understanding of this passage I observe that baptism is a seal of union to Christ, as it is a seal of all the blessings of the covenant of grace. The blessing is in two

*This latter quotation is taken from Mr C's Catechism—This is the only place in which I have paid any attention to that work, a lay gentleman handed me a full reply to that catechism, I thought it not necessary to publish it. Had I thought Mr. C. serious, I should have replied. However, to every discerning reader, it carries its confutation. It may serve for sport; but the intelligent and serious reader is disgusted with it.

respects united to Christ. He has a vital union to him, in which sense, Christ is the vine and they are the branches. They are in this respect said to be one spirit with Christ. John 15. 5. 1 Cor. 6. 17. But there is also a union *in law* between Christ and the believer. In this sense the believer was crucified with Christ. Gal. 2. 20. In the same sense he was buried with Christ. Now because baptism is a seal of that union, subsisting between Christ and the believer, they are said to be 'buried with him by baptism.' So that baptism intimates that the believer died and was buried with Christ. The death and burial of Christ, stand necessarily connected—that sign which represents the one, must necessarily represent the other: but the death of Christ is called the sprinkling or staining of blood: Isaiah 63. 2, 3, which may be represented by the sprinkling of water in baptism.

It indeed appears strange to hear Mr. C. state so fully the connexion between a figure and the reality. Christ was buried, so a person baptized, must be buried under water. Christ arose; so the person must come up from under the water.* To understand, however, the truth of the thing signified, our attention will be called from the mode, to which Mr. C. adhears so particularly. The subject to be baptized will rather enquire, was Christ my surety? am I crucified with Christ? was I buried with him? If these things are facts, then I may take the sign and the seal of these blessings.

* Why but Mr. C. teaches in order to make out the figure, that the person should stay under water 3 days? For if he will follow the letter, this too should be done.

It was the chief object proposed by the baptists to call the attention of their members, to there external ceremonies, while little attention was paid to the heart, so baptists adhere clearly to, and say much about the mode of baptism. If more of that time was spent, in searching for the possession of the thing signified by the water used in this ordinance, it would be better for the souls of their members.

REMARKS ON THE DEBATE, BY THE REV. SAMUEL FINDLEY.

Christian brethren, of every profession;

I am confident you will agree with me that christianity without truth and integrity, is but a shadow without its substance. On the same principle, the person who writes or speaks for the edification of the christian world, is expected to be eminent, for his undoubted veracity. In proportion as he is, on the other hand, detected of incapacity, or indisposition, to speak or write the truth, on every occasion, his reputation in the christian world, ought to be depricated, and his influence renounced. Facts innumerable, might be adduced, to evince the correctness of this principle. For instance, shew me a man who is of known disingenuity in his statement of facts; and I will shew to the world a man on whose doctrinal views of the christian religion, there is little, if any thing, truly scriptural, and vice versa; point me out a man, who dares to lie against the Holy Ghost, speaking in his own word, in teaching, as the doctrines thereof, the vegaries of his own brain; and I will point you out a man, who will regard the truth, in his statement of facts, only so far as his sinister ends may be thereby promoted. Now as that old dragon, who is the Devil and Satan, has always had his children in the world, who delight to do his works; he has them still. There are, even at this day, those who speak great swelling words of vanity and of falsehood, in perverting the truth as it is in Jesus; and who employ themselves, in all the arts of fraud and deceit, in leading captive unwary souls. The Lord has, in former ages, administer-

ed seasonable checks, to the influence of such unprincipled hereticks, by accomplishing that promise, "when error cometh in like a flood, the spirit of Jehovah will lift up a standard against him." This standard has consisted, and must still consist, in the agency employed, by his faithful heralds, in detecting the falsehoods, and rectifying the mistakes, of the grand propagators of error and delusion. In the very fact, therefore, that the church is, in our own day, infested with enemies to all righteousness, the watchmen upon Zion's walls, are called out, to buckle on their armour, and to become as iron pillars, and as brazen walls, in the defence, and vindication of precious truth; they are called forth, to contend earnestly for the faith, that was once delivered to the saints. These remarks have been elicited at present, by Rev. Mr. Walker calling upon me, to furnish, to the christian world, a correction of such mistatements of facts, as might have occured to my notice, in a recent publication, entitled 'the substance of a debate &c. stating, at the same time, that he had undertaken to correct the errors of doctrine contained in that work, and also a number of the statements there made of facts, in a publication now in the press, and in as much as it has ordinarily required, the combined testimony of two or three witnesses, to convict a criminal at the bar of justice, he therefore requested for truth's sake, which had been so audaciously murdered, in the above publication, to furnish a statement, a plain, unvarnished statement of the truth, in opposition to the falsehoods, colourings and perversion of the *substance &c.* As my attention was particularly drawn on the occasion of that debate, and my name particularly implicated in the pub-

lication of its substance, I the more readily stepped forward, to vindicate the truth, in bearing testimony to her sacred claims, in opposition to the propagation of falsehoods the most naked and gross. However, to pursue Mr. Campbell through all his meanderings—to detect him in all his misstatements of facts, and to correct him in all his aberrations, from scriptural principle, would be almost an endless undertaking. One might as well undertake, to trace out the meanderings of a wandering Arab, in order to prove that he did not always tread in a high way; or detect all his particular acts, to prove him an uncultivated savage. The task in either case, would be endless; but it is unnecessary. Once prove that an author is capable of misrepresenting facts, and of maintaining unscriptural principles, and you have left his fabric, as Sampson of old, left the Dagon house of the Philistines, *without its pillars.* This in part, I trust you will find accomplished, by the Rev. Mr. Walker, in relation to the widely circulated, and herculean performance of Alexander Campbell's—To complete the catastrophy, it remains for me, by a few statements, to evince either the incapacity or indisposition of Mr. C. to state the truth. This being done, we trust Mr. Campbell's whole scheme will, as we are convinc'd it ought, to appear, but the baseless fabrick of a vision, without a wreck behind. I indeed feel that my task is a painful one. In detecting a man's misstatement of facts, the subject of criticism, is necessarily held up to society, as an object of abhorrence. On this same account, the critic becomes awfully responsible. It would no doubt be highly desirable, were there none in society so enleagued with the Prince of darkness,

as to give occasion, for their fellow creatures, at any time, to engage in the exercise of such an office. But this we are scarcely authorised to expect; offences must come. And when offence is given on the ground of falsehood, a banner must be displayed on the part of truth. It is nowhere predicted of truth, as it is of iniquity, that as ashamed it shall hide its head. It does not indeed properly belong to truth, nor its advocate, to aim especially for the *last* word. The heretick more frequently seeks for *this*, because he has no other ground, on which, he can hope to gain the ascendency over his antagonist, than that of speaking much, or speaking the last. The advocate of truth, on the other hand, having honestly and candidly, stated the truth, on whatever subject he is called to appear, more generally leaves the further issue of the case, in the hands of that God, whose blessing alone, can, in any case, give genuine success.

But to proceed, Mr. Campbell has stated, in the frontal page of his book, that he "had previous to his publication, made application to me, for a copy of the rules to be observed during the debate, but without effect." It is already before the public, that this statement is incorrect. It has been stated and cannot be disproved, that I never saw, nor met with any person, on the occasion of such a demand.

It has also been stated, and cannot be disproved, that a few lines left at my house, when I was 80 miles from home, was not an application for the *copy* but for the *original draft* of said rules.

Mr. C. then proceeds to state the substance of them from recollection. There is however, a true copy of these rules (the original of which

with Mr. Campbell's own signature affixed, can at any time be exhibited,) inserted in page 4 of this volume. The reader is entreated to compare Mr. Campbell's substance, with the true copy, that he may, the more decidedly determine, how much dependence, he is safe, in placing on Mr. Campbell's *recollections*, (which is the great ground of his narrative,) in other statements. On a fair comparison, it must be perceived, by the candid and judicious reader, that some of Mr. Campbell's rules, both as to substance and form, are an entire forgery.

But again, in Mr. Campbell's statements of what he calls facts, connected with the debate, in the 5th page, we meet with the following words: "The Debate was *closed* by myself, but after I sat down, Mr. Samuel Findly, by an injudicious, and unbecoming address, contrary to the rules by which he, as one of the Moderators, should have been governed, produced an unpleasant excitement in the congregation. But as the public, obviously and emphatically expressed their disapprobation of it, I feel no desire by a minute statement to perpetuate the remembrance of it." Now, whether Mr. Campbell has, in this statement, spoken the truth or not, will be submitted to the reader, after I have given a brief narrative of the transaction, to which he here alludes. Mr. C. has said that he had closed the debate, previous to Mr. Findley's address, of which he complains; and in the same sentence, he states, that said address was contrary to the rules, by which he, as a Moderator, should have been governed. The controversy for which these rules were formed, it appears, was closed. They had consequently lived their day. How then could Mr. Findley's address violate

them? Pray reader do reconcile this if you can. But to be more explicit, it is freely admitted that Mr. F. did give an address at the close of the controversy. What then was the reason, and what the substance of that addsess? These enquiries shall be answered as briefly as possible. If it be found that his reason for giving it was good, and that the matter of it was important; there certainly could be no sufficient cause for unpleasant excitement at the time, nor yet for censorious reflections afterwards.

1st: Then the reason of my address, is to be found in what, I truly conceiv'd to be injudicious & unbecoming & something at least ten degrees worse than either, in Mr. C's. closing addres. Leaving his subject of debate altogether, he undertook to harangue the audience, upon the unfair management of his opponents; as displayed throughout the course of the debate. He even asserted that I had used partiality in the matter of order, and had endeavoured to keep him under undue restraint; & reflected moreover that the judges had disappointed him, in bringing the subject to a hasty close; and that at this he was the more astonished, seeing the regulations made provision for continuing from day to day; with these reflections Mr. Campell concluded his last address. Previous to this unexpected and unprecedent harangue; the thought of speaking in the way of addressing the audience, had not entered my mind— Upon Mr. Campell's concluding I beckoned to the audience. There was the most profound attention given. I proceeded then to deliver an address, the substance of which as I understand, is already inserted, in page 16, 17 18, of this work—Having closed my address, I took my leave of the audience

as respectably as possible, and withdrew. So far as any marks of attention, came under my notice upon my descending the stage, they were entirely of the caressing kind. My friends, at least did not discover any mortification, at my having acted an injudicious and unbecoming part; and I had the opinion of some to the very reverse, who were as capable of judging, either on a question of order or merit, as Mr. C. or any of his friends.

Another instance of Mr. Campell's indisposition or incapacity, to state the truth, you have in a note appended to the 69th page of his book—He there calls Mr. F. the abettor and second, of Mr. W. We have only to say, that Mr. Findley appeared in no such character. No, he appeared on that occasion, as free of personal obligation to second, or abett Mr. W. as Mr. C—;& nothing but the exercise of that prerogative, which he reed from the hand of Mr. Campbell himself, to defend truth, and good order, to the insupportable chagrine of Mr. Campell's lawless spirit, could have induced him, [Mr. C.] groundlessly to apply these contemptible epithets.

In the same page he complains that Mr. F. had made a proposition sooner than he had anticipated to bring the subject under discussion to a close. It is utterly denied that Mr. F. made any such proposition at that time, but with the hearty concurrence of his associate judge. Now is it honest? is it candid? to attribute a decision that was equally concurred in, by each of the judges acting on the occasion, to the unfair interposition of an individual. Such however is the honesty and such the candour of our author.

We have a like instance of disingenuity, in the 76th p. of his book. His words are, "Here I was

interrupted by Mr. F. who objected to this mode of proceeding. He said that as the object of this meeting, was the edification of the public, he could not perceive how the asking and answering of questions could promote their edification, he desire that we should proceed in some way more conducive to their edification. To which I replied— Mr. F. you are doubtless an advocate for the Westminster creed and catechism, and I presume as such, must agree with your bretheren, that the catechetical mode of instruction is the best, as we are now proceeding as the Westminster divines direct, I think you cannot without a dereliction of principle object. Mr. F. then was mute, I proceeded." What magnanimity? What knight-hood was displayed here? Truly when I read this part of Mr. Campbell's report I was induced to exclaim, O truth whither hast thou fled! O shame, O thou *fear* of God & *fear* of man, whither hast thou fled!! Did Mr. Campbell think there were none present that could or would, bear testimony to the truth, in opposition to his abominable perversion? If he did, I assure him he is greatly mistaken. To the audience then present, I appeal, while I write for the satisfaction of those, who have had no other source of information, than the above mistatement of the fact. The truth is this. Mr. Campbell had been stating questions, and making assertions, & pausing in each interim, for the matter of two, three, or four minutes, untill his father had time to write, in full, the words he had used, and then there was a reading, and restating of what had been stated, to ascertain that no mistake had taken place; he stated at the same time, that he was thus particular, with a view to publish to the world the whole of what passed on the occasion. After

he had repeated such intervals again and again, until the audience became quite restless and discomposed, from not having their attention occupied.—and just while Mr. Campbell was suspending his address, in waiting upon his father's transcribing what he had said, I asked him if he was done, he replied no, it was his 40 minutes, and he would occupy them as he pleased.—I observed that it was his 40 minutes to speak and argue, if he had any thing to say, but it was not his time to waste; that the public were waiting for edification; but that they would not be disposed to wait upon his writing a book. This closed the interview between Mr. C. and myself. He progressed in the debate, and I, of course, remained mute. I had succeeded in calling him to order, which was my object in speaking.

See again Page 99, to the same effect. His words are:—"Mr. F. said that he and his associate Moderator thought that enough had been said on the Covenants, &c." Now I have to inform Mr. Campbell, and the public, that the word covenant or covenants, did not escape from my lips at the time; nor was it the subject of remark—our opinion respected the controversy on the subject of baptism. Mr. C. may perhaps, at this, wipe his mouth, and say, is it not a little one? Be it so. It is sufficient to discover his disinclination or incapacity at any time, where fact is concerned, to state the truth.

For another aberration of a similar kind, we invite the reader's attention to p. 118 of his book on the debate &c. There he tells you that Mr. Findley asked the name of the author of the book, which he held in his hand—strange indeed! that Mr. Findley should have asked the name of an au-

thor, whose name he knew as well as Mr. C.—No, no; the world is defied to prove, (except on the ground of perjury,) that Mr. F. said a single syllable to Mr. C. in his course of reading, until he had made his introductory remarks, and passed a fulsome eulogy upon his socinian friend, R. Robertson, and until he had read from page 185, of his history, the follwing sentence: "The African Fathers were the least of all others, tinctured with the true spirit of the sublime religion of Jesus. Slaves themselves, they never thought of christian liberty: and even Cyprian himself, the guide of the rest, durst not think for himself." In opposition to the long train of forged rant which Mr. C. has in his book, I then called him to order, stating that the rules by which my jurisdiction on the occasion was to be governed, absolutely prohibited all diminutive or disrespectful personal allusions—see rule 3rd. and that if this rule had any meaning in it, he was certainly transgressing it. I stated that I apprehended, that by this rule, I was as much bound to protect the character of the dead as of the living, against personal and groundless invective; yea more so, for their character was submitted to our trust, as a kind of sacred deposite. They were not alive to defend it themselves. In this respect they had a claim upon us, that living characters had not. Mr. Campbell's reply was, "Am I not to be permitted to read history as well as my antagonist?" You are sir, said I, at liberty to read history.—Whatever of history you can find in Robertson, or any where else; you are at liberty to read it, but sir, you are not at liberty either to speak or read slander. Mr. C. then exclaimed, with a

kind of frothy sneering, peculiar to himself: "Robertson, an inhabitant of the Holy land, where the holy league and covenant was, is rejected!"

Whether he intended, by such a sneer, to cast contempt upon the Martyrs of Jesus or not, I dare not say. The remark, however, as having this bearing, made my feelings recoil.

After Mr. C. had then bandied the public for some time, in the most unorderly manner, and after some baptist friends had discovered their impatience to bear up their sinking ship, by vociferating here, and there, through the assembly, *read read*; I called again to order, and observed that lest some might suspect me for wishing to keep something, that might have the semblance of reason, and evidence, out of view, I would give Mr. C. special privilege to read, from his socinian friend, as much as he pleased; but I would advise the audience to obtain, and read at their leisure, John P. Campell's review of Robertson's History, and also Cave's lives of the Fathers, that hereby they would find themselves fortified against the slanders and misrepresentations of the author now read. Upon this intimation Mr. C. proceeded to read a few, but very few passages, from his highly favorite historian. I am sorry to say, or even to think, but so it is, as fact would not admit of Mr. Campbell's venting that strain of accusation against me, which the cravings of his venomous nature required, wherever he has the slightest occasion to foist in my name, in his rancorous publication, he has connected with it, a forgery of his own, to make it appear, as he thought, sufficiently black.

In the 124th page, we have another instance of

the same kind.—He there states, that Mr. F. at the instance of Mr. Walker, wished the debate to be closed by once speaking on each side. The statement, is obviously intended to bias the public, with the apprehension, that Mr. Walker was exhausted or tired, with his part of the controversy. Now if Mr. Walker will say, with Mr. C. that he consulted me to the above effect; I will then agree to give a libel upon myself, in respect to every instance, in which, I have correced Mr. Campbell's misrepresentations. No, No. There was no such consultation on the part of Mr. W. He was indeed opposed to coming to a close as soon as he did.—But during the intermission of which Mr. C. speaks, I mentioned to Mr. Walker, that he must either choose another judge or they must adopt some measures, by which they could draw to a close, that evening; my circumstances at home, being such, that I could remain no longer with them. The measures employed to bring it to a close were altogether of my own projecting, and occasoned by family and congrational circumstances. Instead of Mr. Walker giving out in the controversy, as Mr. C. at different times, fondly insinuates; it was the decided opinion, of all I heard speak of their performance, that Mr. Walker did much better, and Mr. Campbell much worse, the second day, than the first.—If Mr. Walker had any inward fears, I have only to say, I never heard him, nor any person for him, express them.

Having thus far, proceeded to acquit my conscience of an obligation to the public, in the cause of slandered truth, I commit and leave the issue, in the hand of that God, who is in every place, at all times, beholding the evil and the good.—He is the God of truth; and I know he

will, in his own time, reduce to silence every lying lip.—That his will may be done in all things pertaining to his own glory and the interests of truth, is the sincere prayer of your servant for Jesus' sake.

SAMUEL FINDLEY.

A LETTER

TO

Dr. SAMUEL RALSTON,

Minister of the Gospel, in the Congregation of Mingo creek and Williamsport.

BY JOHN WALKER,

Pastor of the associate Congregation of Unity and Mountpleasant, Ohio.

Let the righteous smite me; *it shall be* a kindness: and let him reprove me; *it shall be* an excellent oil' *which* shall not break my head. Psal. 141. 5.

Rev. Sir,

While we agree on the subject of Baptism in general, I am sorry to find a difference of sentiment, prevailing in any respect, on a subject so important. Baptists may be disposed to take the same advantage of these disputations, that infidels take of those disputes that divide the christian world, i.e. to deny the whole system. Baptists should, however, remember that among themselves they are not agreed, for besides all the different sects, that are denominated baptist Mr. Campbell, one of their late writers, has devised a plan for the supportof their falling system, chiefly out of his own brain, a plan unknown to the Apostles or their successors—to Dr Gill or Mr. Booth. And while his system possesses an authority no higher than himself, yet it differs as much from other baptist writers, as if the propositions they defended had been entirely different.

In defence of publick disputes, it appears scarcely necessary that I should make any observations. Whatever were your sentiments when you first heard of the dispute, between Mr. Campbell and myself, you certainly now justify our conduct: you have not only disputed with Mr. C. but when he made an attempt to reply, you answered. Your dispute with Mr. C. is still more publick than mine was; the only difference is that you disputed on paper, in the absence of your opponent, while I contended in his presence. Our methods differ; yet sir, it must be conceded that by the method adopted by Mr. C. and myself, it was most probable the subject would receive the most fair and full investigation.

A writer gives form to the argument he opposes, but in disputation *viva voce*, each side for

themselves, forms the argument, and to it, in that shape, the reply must be given. This done in the presence of the publick, carries a conviction with it, which no paper can afford: where human passions, or ill nature is mixed with such disputations, they are not only unprofitable. but degrading. But I can assure you, in our public dispute, there was nothing even like wrath, and had his book been a true *portrait* of that dispute, there would have been no necessity for me ever to have addressed any thing to the public, on paper.

To the plan of disputing you have adopted, I also give my consent. I now adopt the same, yet would always prefer the former where it can be obtained. The great apostle of the Gentiles give me the example in Athens; Acts 17. 17. also with Peter. Gal. 2. 19. To this plan also acceded our reforming forefathers, such as Knox, Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius and others, and indeed some of their opponents were but a small degree sounder in the faith than Mr. C.

I have a cloud of witnesses in my favor: I think the church was much edified, by the explicit, and publick manner the reformers defended truth. I could wish the same attempts were more frequent. For my own part, I am fully rewarded for all my toil in that debate, not only by the accession to the church, which succeeded it, but also by the spirit of inquiry which it produced, which to many, I hope, issued in an understanding of the truth.

Different from our reforming predecessors, we afford error a rest too quiet and peaceful in the church: we are not valiant for the truth upon the earth. While peace is the general language of the church, we, coward-like, stand disarmed and

witness the advance of error, and the consequent decay of truth.

I shall now, sir, endeavour briefly, yet plainly, to state the leading doctrines, in your letters, which I cannot subscribe.

The first of them is your view of the covenant of circumcision. You appear to deny that this covenant was a dispensation of the covenant of grace. You suppose that my assumption of this principle in the early stage of the debate, compelled me to support it, through the publick disputation. But I can assure you, sir, that I assumed no principle in any stage of the controversy but those which were the result of deliberate consideration. I therefore again declare

That the covenant of circumcision was a dispensation of the covenant of grace.

When I find any of the blessings of the covenant of grace, dispensed in the form of covenant, I thought myself justifiable in calling such dispensation, a dispensation of the covenant of grace, because the blessings dispensed belong to that covenant alone. There are no blessings in the covenant of grace, but may be considered as the property of the church. Now, sir, if I can prove that any promise made to Christ the Head, from all eternity, in the covenant of grace, "was revealed in the covenant of circumcision, then it will follow, that at least so far the covenant of circumcision, was a dispensation of the covenant of grace. But this is proved, Psal. 89 35, 36, 37. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon; and as a faithful witness in Heaven.' But this promise is found in

the covenant of circumcision, Gen. 17. 9. 'And I will establish my covenant between thee, and me, and thy seed after thee, in their generations for an everlasting covenant." The persons to whom the promises refer are the same, Abraham's *true* seed: These were also the seed of Christ. Gal. 3. 29. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." Where then is the absurdity of saying that the one was a dispensation of the other, when they dispense the same blessings, to the same heirs.

You object 1st, 'As circumcision was the seal 'which God himself, affixed to that covenant, and as 'a seal, the moment it is affixed, gives the persons on 'whose behalf the covenant was made, all the advan-'tages therein contained: it follows by inevitable con-'sequence, that if that covenant was the covenant of 'grace, then every circumcised person must be 'saved; and if baptism is come in the room of circum-'cision, that every baptised person must be saved 'also.'

I reply, 1st, That you will certainly consider that the Lord's supper is a seal of the covenant of grace: will you now admit your own inference? 'It follows by inevitable consequence,' that every person admitted into the full communion of the Church, must be saved.' It is impossible for me to see any difference in the premises. The conclusion must be the same.*

2nd. I have shown in the preceeding work, that there

*Was the Doctor aware of this difficulty in his system? Or, will he deny that the Lord's supper is a seal of the covenant of grace. or in other words, that there are no seals to the covenant of grace? The Lord's supper is as truly 'affixed by God himself, as circumcision or baptism: are all members in the full communion of the church 'saved?'

is a difference between affixing a seal to a covenant, and discharging the duties of the same. In baptism or the Lord's supper, the seal is affixed, but by a life of conformity to the law of God, we can alone discharge the duties of it.

3rd. The utmost that can be inferred from the circumstance of a person being baptised, is, that they are under the laws of Christ's house, and entitled to all its visible privileges. The simple truth appears to be; that there is a visible relation existing between Christ and all the members of the visible church, and that they are entitled to all the external privileges of the church, so long as they conform to her visible laws.

You, however, observe in the page last cited, "But what is on external relation to a covenant? Is it not in other words to be out of a covenant?" Permit me, sir, to answer your query; That to be externally related to a covenant, is to be an external member of it; and not in other words "to be out of a covenant." What is the church on earth, if she is not a visible body, possessing external privileges, and under a visible law? In order that any of these external benefits should be, in reality, profitable, I grant that it is necessary they should be inwardly applied, or in other words that there should be something more than an external relation—This forms a visible title to invisible benefits.

What inward or spiritual blessingdoes the church on earth enjoy, which is not first visible and external. Even faith, a spiritual gift by which we enjoy all others, comes by an external ordinance. "By hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10, 17. Hence where this external display of the gospel is not, we have no divine warrant to be-

lieve that spiritual blessings exist. The scripture forbids the hope. Prov. 29.15.

Ten children may have an equal right in a will; five through profligacy may never inherit any part of the estate, will I assert, as you have done, that in "other words they were without a covenant" or *will*? My assertion would be found contrary to the fact: the instrument signed by the testator would pronounce me false. But the covenant, about which we dispute, is *diatheke* a will or testament, in which the external rights and privileges of the heirs are the same: the legal reason why they do not possess the inheritance *willed*, is because, "they forsake their own mercies." The external standing of the ten virgins, mentioned in Matthew, 25. were the same. It was not until Christ the Bridegroom, called them from time, by death, that the difference was discovered.

This doctrine, you have materially conceded; for although you appear unwilling to admit that the covenant of circumcision, was an administration of the covenant of grace; yet your concessions cannot be ture, without admitting the truth of my position, because,

1st. You call the covenant of circumcision an ecclesiastical covenant. Now, sir, what is an ecclesiastical covenant, but a covenant of the church? and what else is the covenant of grace? Two parties are necessary, to form a covenant. In this, your ecclesiastical covenant, God must have been one party, and the church the other. But we have no account of any other covenant in which God and the church were parties, besides the covenant of grace. The apostle Peter when he refers to the covenant of circumcision certainly, however, refers to it, as the covenant of grace.

"Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Acts 3. 25. This passage will establish the following things.

1st. That all nations had an equal interest in this covenant. 2nd. That Christ was the alone medium, through which the blessings of the covenant of circumcision were to be dispensed. The apostle Paul so comments on the same passage, Gal. 8. 16. 'Now to Abraham & his seed were the promises made. He saith not and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ.' From the view taken of your ecclesiastical covenant by Peter and Paul, it is evident they recognize Christ as its head; the person, through whom all its blessings are to be enjoyed; and a covenant in which all true believers have an equal interest. I think, sir, you and I understand a covenant of this discription to be the covenant of grace; if not, in what respect does it differ?

2nd. You concede 'that it was a covenant graciously designed and wisely calculated, as a 'mean to an end, to interest them in the blessings 'of the covenant of grace, consisting in pardon, 'sanctification and eternal life.' page 4. By this you must mean, one of two things; either, 1st. that this covenant prepared its subjects for re-receiving these spiritual blessings; or 2nd that they were contained in the covenant of circumcision. If you believe the former; then your sentiment must be that God the Father did through Christ, as federal Head, enter into two covenants with the church; the first of which was to prepare them for the latter, the first contained

the means, the latter the end; the first 'was calculated to interest them' in the latter. But I do not believe this *novel* theory to be yours; you must then believe that pardon, sanctification, &c. were dispensed in that covenant. It follows, that as the covenant of grace alone, contained these blessings, the covenant of circumcision, was a dispensation of the covenant of grace.

3rd. You concede, that it is 'undeniable, that 'infants were introduced into that church by cir-'cumcision.' The church is a BODY holy to the Lord,—an inheritance prepared. Acts 20.28 Your concession implies, that by circumcision they were united to that body, of which Christ is the Head. Col. 1.18. But the moment they were united to this body, they were entitled to all the privileges of it, as they became capable to receive them, and bound by all their laws. The righteousness of Christ, the foundation of all these privileges, was sealed to Abraham by circumcision. Rom. 4.11. But this righteousness and all the blessings flowing from it, are the blessings of the covenant of grace. Therefore circumcision was a sign and a seal of the blessings of the covenant of grace.

In a word, you concede that 'they are engrafted into the good olive tree.' page 13. Initiated by this ordinance, among 'the assembly of saints,' among a 'chosen nation' a 'chosen people.' page 7. If so, it certainly follows, that however unprofitable their standing be to themselves, yet they are visible members of that body, possessing all the external relation and privileges, that saints do, and must therefore by God, be dealt with, as 'covenant breakers,' which could not be true, unless in some sense, they had been in the covenant.

The passage you chiefly urge for the confirmation of this your opinion is, Rom. 3. 2. 'What advantage hath the Jew, or what profit is there of circumcision? much every way; chiefly, because that unto them, were committed the oracles of God.' Your view of the passage is, that the oracles of God 'are said to be the chief advantage, which those 'who were interested in that covenant by circum-'cision, derived from it; and until it is proved, 'that the words, the oracles of God.' imply in 'them, justification, sanctification and eternal life, 'this single passage settles the point at once.' P. 14, *note*.

For the proper understanding of this passage you will suffer a few observations.

1st. That by the 'oracles of God,' we are to understand the scriptures of truth, and that in Rom. 3. 2. we are chiefly to understand old testament scriptures, because these were given to the subjects of circumcision first.

2nd. We are in a still more extensive sense, to understand by these oracles, all the ordinances warranted by the scriptures, together with all the previleges they contained. These, the same apostle and in the same epistle, declares to be the peculiar privilege of the subjects of circumcision. Rom 9. 4. 'Who are Isralites;' to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service *of God*, and the promises.' This, the old testament church knew to be their peculiar previlege. Deut. 4. 8. 'And what nation is so great, that hath statutes and Judgments so righteous, as all this law, which I set before you this day.' Now, sir, 'the church of God is one and indivisible.' Therefore all these ordinances are, in every age of the world, the

special property of the church. This sentiment is fully confirmed in Psalms, 98. 5. 6.

In what sense are we to understand the Scriptures of truth? I answer, in no other sense, than a dispensation of the covenant of grace. I consider the scriptures to be the *written testament* of Christ, sealed by his blood, as testator. Will you say that Christ, as testator, sealed two *wills*, one an ecclesiastical *will*, the other the *testament* of grace? The apostle, therefore, in asserting that it was a benefit arising from circumcision, that unto them were committed 'the oracles of God; which by the reasoning before, must have intimated, that a dispensation of the covenant of grace, was the peculiar privilege of the subjects of circumcision.

This, indeed, you appear to concede in page 81. 'But the covenant of circumcision, secured only 'the ordinances of religion, as the means of grace 'to the circumcised.' But what can any person understand by the ordinances of religion, but a dispensation of the blessings of the covenant of grace? Now, these ordinances belonged to the covanant of circumcision; therefore the blessings of the covenant of grace, were dispensed in the covenant of circumcision, or in other words, the covenant of circumcision was a dispensation of the covenant of grace.

To these Israelites, the subjects of circumcision, 'pertained the promises.' Rom. 9. 4. In what covenant were these promises contained? I think you will grant, that they were gospel promises, and if so, you will not deny that they were promises of the covenant of grace. It follows that the covenant of circumcision, was a dispensation of the covenant of grace.

But until it is proved, that the words, the 'oracles of God' imply in them, justification, sanctification and eternal life, this single passage settles the point.' Now, sir, I would have supposed, that little reasoning was necessary to prove to you, that in the 'oracles of God,' justification &c. were dispensed to men, and that he, who by a living faith, received these oracles, received in them all these spiritual blessings.

Do you believe, that there is any outward dispensation of the covenant of grace? If there is, it must be the Scriptures of truth; the oracles of God; the word preached, &c. why then deny that justification, sanctification and eternal life, are dispensed in these oracles?

Now, what is your theory on the subject of the covenant of circumcision?

1st. That the covenant of circumcision was an ecclesiastical covenant; containing no promises,—for had it possessed any promises, and these have been claimed by faith, still it could not have dispensed pardon or eternal life—it was not a dispensation of the covenant of grace: it had none of these blessings in it.

2nd. There are two covenants existing between God and man; one of which contains the means, the other the end. But had the covenant of grace been a perfect contract, then it would have contained both means and end; it would have contained all the provisions, conditions, and means, necessary to put all its subjects into full possession of all its blessings. And then one of two covenants would have been unnecessary.

3rd. This ecclesiastical covenant, has but one sign, or seal; this was circumcision, and is now baptism. All the things signified or sealed, are

means—no spiritual blessings,—for this reason, that a seal is a security for the blessings contained in the covenant alone, to which it is appended.

In a word, the covenant of circumcision was not a gospel covenant; because the gospel is a dispensation of the covenant of grace. It is indeed on this plan, difficult to say, what the covenant of circumcision was; unless you say with me, that it was a dispensation of the covenant of grace.

The SECOND POINT, in which I differ from the sentiments you have expressed, on the subject of debate, between Mr. Campbell and myself, is that which you declare to be the design of circumcision and baptism. You say, 'I do not consider 'circumcision and baptism, as primarily designed, 'for the purpose of building up believers in holi-'ness; but as ordinances designed for the conver-'sion of sinners, of a certain character.' page 39. This '*certain character*,' or qualification necessary in order to admit adults to baptism, or parents who desire their children admitted by this ordinance, you declare to be 'a speculative faith, and sense of guilt.' Your reader now perceives the reason why you deny circumcision and baptism to be seals of the covenant of grace, because they intimate no interest in Christ, but are only means to interest. It is a way to possess the blessings, but is not a seal of possession.

I shall now give some reasons, why I cannot subscribe the sentiments you have expressed on this subject.

That the faith required of persons, in order to their admission to this ordinance, is not, as you suppose, a speculative, but a true and living faith is evident, because no other kind of faith was, or

indeed could be, required by the divine law. It is, I believe, absurd to suppose that the law of God requires a faith, the very character of which is disobedience. You will certainly concede, that the gospel of Christ, presents to every person, where it comes, all the blessings it contains. The law of God requires every sinner to accept these blessings, and this it requires under the pains and penalty of eternal death. But it cannot be supposed that a temporary, or speculative faith, will answer the Divine requisition, or will such faith deliver from the punishment due to unbelief, why then suppose that such faith can be a true pre-requisite, entitling us to any ordinance?

The true state of a person, not possessing saving faith, is, that he is a child of wrath. From this character, he is not delivered by 'speculative faith,' or a 'sense of guilt.' In relation to the gospel of Jesus, the whole duty of a sinner is marked out by the divine law. It requires him to accept Christ as his Saviour, and all the blessings that centre in him. A sinner, feeling convinced of the truth of the following assertions, that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of sinners, that the law requires him to accept of Christ, as his Saviour: that he is a guilty sinner, that without faith he must be damned,—is willing to make a profession of these truths. Query, will he have in consequence of this, his faith, any interest in the covenant of grace, or a right to any of its blessings? No sir, when the faith of the man advances no further, when he refuses to appropriate the blessings, that he needs, and to obey the law which he is persuaded requires such appropriation, his guilt is greatly increased; he knows

his master's will, and does it not; he is entitled to *many stripes*, but not to *any privileges*.

For the establishment of your theory, you first reason from the character given of the church. 'Abraham and all his servants were circumcised.' 'I would now ask, if you can believe, that all 'these, with all their countless offspring, to the 'coming of the Mesiah, were true believers.' P. 40. I answer that the former system on this subject, does not require us to believe that they were all united to Christ by faith. It only requires us to believe, that it was their duty and the duty of their seed, that desire the ordinance of circumcision for themselves or their children, to possess a true and living faith. True holiness, which could have no existence without saving faith, was required in the very introduction of the covenant of circumcision. Gen. 17. 1. 'Walk before me, and be thou perfect.' To that which was contained in the covenant of circumcisson, all its subjects were bound, and of this they made a public profession, when they were circumcised. In receiving this ordinance, they must therefore have agreed, to walk before God perfectly; to receive the Lord as their God Almighty. v. 1. To receive the blessings of this covenant as everlasting. v. 7. But because Abraham was required to teach this covenant to all under his care, and because the Head of the church recognized him as a man, who would 'command his children and his household after him; Chap. 18. 19. Therefore, to his household also, was extended the seal of these privileges. If any of these were found irreligious, they were like other apostates, 'covenant breakers.'

Every parent presenting his child for baptism,

is required as Abraham was, to walk before God and be perfect, and to possess that faith, by which alone, his obedience can be acceptable, and to 'command his children and his household after him;' and in the way of engaging to these duties, to receive this ordinance.

In the covenant of circumcision was contained the three following things.

1st. The duties required.

2nd. The promises stated.

3rd. The seal affixed.

In receiving the last, the subjects of that covenant were bound by faith, to receive the promises, and essay the duties. I therefore reason, that the obedience which God required in this and every other covenant, in which he is a party, must be rendered according to the true spirit and intention of his law, which, you will acknowledge, is by saving faith alone. In every case where the gospel presents a promise, the law requires the acceptance of faith. But a promise was given to Abraham and to his seed, in the covenant of circumcision, before he was circumcised, and he possessed the faith required, proved in Rom. 4. 11. But that which was the moral duty of Abraham, is also the duty of all desiring to be, as he was, initiated into the church of Christ. It is their duty first to believe the promises of the gospel, by a living faith. 2nd. To profess a determination through the grace of God promised, to live a holy life. 3rd. To receive baptism for themselves, or their children. This is found to be the order by which Abraham and his household were admitted.

You reason from the letter or form of expression used in Scripture. 'How opposite to what

'is said in the scriptures of Zion, or the church, 'and of Zion it shall be said, this and that man 'was born IN her' And Jerusalem, (another epi-'thet of the church,) which is above and is free, 'is said to be the 'Mother of us all.' page 41.

On the first of these texts, I observe, that you would certainly consider the promise equally accomplished, in the admission of those regenerated before they are admitted into the church, that you would of those converted after they become members; if so, you cannot then draw any argument from the passage, in favor of your hypothesis. To give your opinion its full force upon the passage, it is; that the church receives honor alone, from those who enroll themselves, among her citizens, at a time when they are enemies to God by wicked works; because they are ungenerate sinners, or in other words, the way to seek the face of Jacob, so as to honor him with their birth, is to seek him in that way which dishonors his Lord; a sentiment, you would as unwillingly subscribe as myself. I consider the true import of the passage to be, that in a day of the reviving of the church, converts of every nation and tongue, will reckon it their true glory to become citizens of Zion, and consider it as truly their native kingdom, as if they had been born Jews, and had Abraham for a natural father. And with me agrees Molierus, who has given a celebrated commentary on the book of Psalms. Of much the same import, is the second passage you quote.

You reason from Rom. 11. 20. 'Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.' You observe on this passage: 'It 'follows by fair consequence, that the faith by 'which the Jews stood, was a faith that could be,

'and was lost; but this is not the case with the 'faith of God's elect.' But permit me to observe, that the faith which they forsook, was the same, by which the new testament church stands; because 'unbelief' is not the contrary of a speculative, but of a true faith, but they had substituted unbelief for its contrary, and therefore were broken off. It follows that they once stood by the same faith, in which we now stand. Would it not be absurd to say that the church, at any period, stood by a speculative faith? Is it not the same, as saying, that she once stood by unbelief?

I believe, sir, that if the whole Jewish nation had possessed a speculative faith, & had expressed the same as the centurian, who commanded the band of murderers that killed Christ did, their true situation would have been no better than it was, they would still have been broken off.

It follows, that the Jewish Church lost true and living faith. Although no individual, that possessed this faith, ever lost it, yet the Jewish nation lost their church character; they ceased to be a body under Christ, the head; and such of their members, as had a true and living faith, were the branches, by which the church continued, and among whom, the New-Testament branches were grafted.

In your examination of that faith and repentence, which you suppose were required in their admission to baptism, you first reason from Acts, 2. 38. "Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, & ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." As to the various meanings you have given us, of the word *re-*

pentance, I have no particular objections: but the reasons you offer, why this word, in the passage, is not to be understood as evangelical repentance, do not satisfy me: because you suppose that we can only infer from the declaration of Peter, that he required a change of mind. "Peter says, *metanoesate*, change your minds, with respect to this Jesus of Nazareth, whom ye have considered as an impostor, and crucified as such, and as an evidence that your change of mind is real, 'be baptized, every one of you.' That something more than a simple change of mind, was required by the Apostle, is evident, from the influence that the sermon he had just preached, had upon them; 'they were pricked in their heart.' This intimated a deep, piercing wound, that the sermon had produced in their consciences; strong legal conviction, it was evident that they were afraid, that the man, whom they had crucified and slain, would again appear as their awful Judge, to take vengeance on their wicked conduct. v. 37. "Now when they had heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the Apostles, men and brethern, what shall we do?" according to your view of the subject, Peter's answer implied nothing more than that which they had already expressed —Nay, he required even less; it was only, 'change your minds.'

I also object to the construction you give the words used by Peter: "For the remission of sins." 'This baptism is for the remission of sins,' 'or a 'mean appointed by him, that you may receive 'the remission of your sins.' P. 43. Saving fath is the proper mean of Justification, or the remission of sins; by this act we claim the righteousness of Christ, the alone ground of Pardon. The

Scripture has established the connexion and order of means, and end in the work of conversion. Rom. 10. 17: 'Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.' Chap. 3. 28, 'Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith.' Repentance is not, in Scripture, declared to be a mean of the 'remission of sin,' but legal repentance is produced by the common preparation, and evangelical repentance, by the special preparations of the Spirit of God; the former preceding, and the latter following, justification, and instead of being a mean, is a proper consequence of it.

On the view you have taken of this passage, I concede, that 'baptism is a badge of discipleship to Christ.' But does speculative faith, or legal repentance constitute a man, a disciple of Christ? If so, it can only be a badge of hypocrisy.

I also concede the truth of the reason you give, why Peter required them to be baptised: 'as an evidence that your change of mind is real, be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Christ.' But, Sir, is legal repentance accompanied with a speculative faith, 'a real change of mind,' in the eyes of God? Is it not a repentance, which needs to be repented of?

In a word, my view of the passage is, that the Apostle, used the words, 'repent, every one of you,' to intimate the insufficiency of that repentance, which they had already manifested, by which they were pricked to the heart; and therefore now requires from them a repentance, entirely distinct in its nature, an evangelical repentance: because a repentance, built upon the former, would be 'like the morning cloud and early dew;' it would 'pass away.' The spirit of his language, then is, having a true hold of the righte-

ousness of Christ, the Lord, whom 'ye have crucified and slain,' and possessing a Godly sorrow for the sin of crucifying him, come forward, and give an evidence of the sincerity of these, your exercises, by enlisting under his banner, by claiming a gospel security, for obtaining the blessings he has purchased, by your receiving the ordinance of baptism, and thereby, evidence to the world, that you have claimed his pardoning mercy, manifested in the forgiveness of your sins.

You argue, that the faith required, was only a speculative faith.

1st. From acts 8. 12, 13. 'But when they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women; then Simon himself believed also: and when he was baptized, &c. What was the faith these persons professed to have? I answer, it was a living, and not a speculative faith. That any of them possesed a true faith, I cannot say, but that they made a profession of this faith, is the thing in question, and that which I shall endeavour to prove.

It is evident first from the case of Simon Magus. The faith which he had, we percieve was not real; It is evident from the character given of him by Peter, that he acted hypocritically, when he made the profession of his faith. 'Thy heart is not right in the sight of God.' He professed to be, that which he was not. He was among those of whom the Psalmist speaks. 'Nevertheless they did flatter him with their mouth, and they lied to him with their tongues; for their heart was not right with him; neither were they stedfast in his covenant.' Psal. 78. 36, 37. But if Simon Magus had professed nothing, but a spec-

ulative faith, Philip might have addressed him in the stile of Peter at the time he offered himself a candidate for 'baptism, he might then have told 'him that his heart was not right with God.' Because his faith was only speculative. Nay, Philip might then have declared, 'I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity, the state in which every sinner is, who possesses nothing, but a speculative faith. Thus according to your view, the ministers were not deceived in the character of Simon Magus, he professed the faith which in fact he possessed—a speculative faith He was no hypocrite—his profession and faith agreed, which I think, however, is very different from the history given of him in the scripture.

The faith of the other persons admitted by Philip, may be judged, by the subject of Philip's sermon; it was the 'kingdom of God.' In which, it is evident, that he so displayed the privileges of this kingdom, as that they were willing to enroll themselves among her citizens. But did Philip preach that they should only yield in historical faith. No, he must have taught that the King of this kingdom, was the Lord *their* righteousness.' When they professed to believe, they certainly declared by their profession, that they accepted him as their king, and his kingdom as their rest. If their hearts corresponded with their profession, you will agree with me, that their faith was saving.

That the time, which they had to judge of the sincerity of their faith, was very short, I grant; yet the spirit of God at that time, wrought with much greater power, than it does at present, and therefore, a shorter time for judgement was suffici-

ent at that time, than at the present. They were however, sometimes deceived, and so are you and I, even when we have a previous knowledge of persons for years.

You suppose that it is impossible for us to file the cases of the Eunuch, and Lydia as exceptions to the theory you have given. Because, you say in case of the Eunuch, either he was a true believer before, and then it does not lie in controversy—or that the statement given does not necessarily suppose saving faith; and 'imports nothing more than sincerity.' page 45. But sir, I hope that a plain view of the statement will convince you to the contrary. Act 8. 36, 37. 'And the Eunuch said, see, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest.' The pre-requisite here required for admission to baptism, was believing with all the heart, this was the moral requisition, less than this either expressed or implied, could not be required.—Christ demanded the same, although not mentioned as a pre-requisite to baptism. Luke 10. 27. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind.' It is in this way alone, that this command of God is to be obeyed. 'That we should believe on the name of his son Jesus Christ.' 1. John 3. 23. Now sir, how was the Eunuch required to believe? 'With all thy heart,' i. e. with your whole soul accept Jesus as the Lord your righteousness. Who will say with you, that this command only required speculative faith?

Whatever may be reasoned from the language of the Eunuch's reply, this must be evident, that Philip received it as an answer to his pre-requi-

site; and that he hereby declared that Jesus was the son of God, that he accepted him as his divine Saviour, and declared his willingness to make a public profession of his name, by receiving the the sacriment of baptism. But if Philip only required speculative faith, and this the only faith possessed, then this was another admission like Simon Magus—they both had speculative faith; it was all, according to your opinion Philip required of either.

The same observations will apply to all the other cases you mention, such as Saul of Tarsus, the jailor &c. whether any or all of these persons were converted prior to their baptism, I cannot determine, but the question is what kind of faith was required of them before their admission to baptism? I shall conclude this subject, by simply stating a few further arguments in favor of the position I have espoused.

ARGUMENT, FIRST.

If God never required any faith but a living faith, then a speculative faith is not a moral prerequisite to baptism.

But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

The argument is proved. Heb. 11. 6. 'But without faith it is impossible to please him.' To say that God would in any case require speculative faith, is to say that he repuires that which would displease him.

ARGUMENT, SECOND.

If the moral law demands perfect obedience,

then it never did require in any case speculative faith.

But the former is true, and therefore the latter.

I suppose you will not deny any of the terms of this syllogism. But the conclusion is equally true and fair, because the divine law cannot require any obedience short of that which pleases God—If the law requires saving faith we cannot obey its commands by yielding speculative faith.—

What object is to be gained by planting dead trees in a garden,—trees that possess no living principle?—You may water and dung about them they decay the more speedily. Yet sir, you would allow the keepers of Christ's vineyard to fill it with such vines— people having only a dead faith.

Is this not a speedy method to corrupt the church of Christ.—To fill it with those that hate him, all unbelievers are haters of Christ—their character is not changed by possessing a speculative faith.

Christ has appointed ordinances to prepare the sinner for entering into the church, let these be faithfully used. When they appear to have gained their object, then let the person be admitted by baptism into the church.

The THIRD and only point of disagreement that I shall now mention is the view you have given us of the baptism of John, as you have not reasoned any on this point, but rather appears to take it for an assertion which none would contradict; I rather thought it, at least, my duty to notice it, lest you might suppose, that I was among the number of them, that believed that the baptism of John was not christian baptism. You assert, 'that admitting that it could be incontrovertibly

'proved, that John's baptism was administered by 'immersion, yet it would not thence follow that 'christian baptism, was to be administered in the 'same manner. John's baptism belonged not to 'the christian, but to the Jewish dispensation of grace.' page 58.

Upon this I intend to make but a very few observations, as I have already exceeded the usual bounds of a letter.

Those who deny John's baptism to be christian baptism, object; 1st. That it was instituted under the old Old Testament dispensation. I answer, so also was the Lord's supper. The death of Christ was the close of the former dispensation. Every precept of the cerimonial law, had its full force, until all its typical rites had their accomplishment in the sacrifice of the great antitype; but prior to this event, the Lord's supper was instituted. Although it was indeed shortly before the close of that dispensation, yet it is sufficient that it was instituted before the death of Christ, it was instituted under the Old Testament dispensation; and therefore according to your assertion cannot be a New Testament ordinance.

2nd. It is objected, that it was in existence before that circumcision ceased to be an ordinance of the church, and therefore could not come in the room of circumcision. I answer, that all ordinances exist in the church, according to the will of her HEAD and Lord. He may, or may not appoint seals according to his righteous pleasure.

I conclude, that for a short season, three seals existed to the covenant of grace, and this concession implies no more, than that the church having for a long period of time, been accustom-

ed to circumcision, as the initiating seal of the covenant of grace, were gradually introduced to the ordinances of the New Testament, the present dispensation gradually appeared; the darkness of that dispensation, by the appearing of the son of righteousness, was by degrees diminished, but before their dispensation was closed, our ordinances, which were to take the place of theirs, made their appearance. Thus while our fathers had their own ordinances, they had the pleasure of seeing ours.

This hypothesis, I suppose, is generally supported by those who fear to admit premises, from which the baptist may draw conclusions unfavourable to pedo-baptism. Lest Mr. Campbell might have supposed that I intended to have taken the same advantage, I publicly intimated in an early stage of debate, that I believed John's baptism to be christian baptism, and feared no conclusion my opponent could draw from my assersion.

3rd. It is objected, that those baptised with the baptism of John, were re-baptised by Paul. This objection is founded on Acts, 19. 3, 4, 5. 'And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? and they said, unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the People, that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus.' Let it be observed on this passage,

1st. That by the Holy Ghost, in the passage, we are not to understand the saving operation of the Holy Spirit, but the miraculous outpourings of the Spirit, which commenced on the day of penticost, and continued for some time in the Church;

because the person of the Holy Spirit, and his saving operations, were taught in the Old-Testament, to which these converts had access.

2nd. That Paul shews them the nature of John's baptism, that in that ordinance, they had been taught the nature of true repentance, the character of Christ Jesus, and the necessity of faith in his name.

3rd. When Paul had shewn the nature of John's baptism, he then intimates to these people, that when the hearers of John had understood this, his doctrine, they made a public profession of the faith by receiving his baptism, and here he is not speaking particularly of these whom he now addressed, but of the hearers of John in general.

4th. That the Apostle, finding that these people had received by faith, Jesus Christ preached to them by John, and having made a public profession of their faith, by receiving baptism from John, he now lays his hands upon them, that they might receive the miraculous outpourings of the Holy Spirit.

I have now given you the view of Beza, and some of the best commentators upon the passage; & I think upon due reflection, you will agree that these persons were not re-baptised. Indeed, the same reason that would render it necessary to re-baptise these persons, would also require the re-baptism of the eleven Apostles, and many others, who had no other than John's baptism.

That the baptism of John was Christian baptism, will appear from a few observations.

1st. That if the baptism of John, was not Christian baptism, then neither Christ nor his disciples, received christian baptism.—Christ did not, he was baptized with the baptism of John

alone, this will, indeed dishonor the New Testament church, seeing that Christ was regularly initiated a member of the Old-Testament church by circumcision, but never was initiated a member of the New Testament by baptism. The eleven Apostles were never, according to this doctrine, initiated, by baptism, members of the New Testament church—they were unbaptized ministers of Christ—a doctrine, which, I think none should assert.

2nd. For the same reason, that the baptism of John could not be christian baptism, because it was under the former dispensation. The baptism of the disciples, before the death of Christ, could not be christian, not one of the 120 disciples by this, had received christian baptism.

3rd. The language of John intimated that his baptism was christian. 'He that sent me to baptise.' Had it been any of the Jewish washings, he would have no special commission, the levitical law would have marked his duty. If the washing by John, had belonged to the Jewish purgations, we should have heard his baptism, announced at Mount Sinia, or from the tabernacle in the wilderness; but his intimation, that he had a distinct commission from any of his predecessors, declares that he had particular duties to discharge, not belonging to that dispensation.

Thus, sir, I have taken a very brief view of the baptism of John, of the faith required as prerequisite to baptism, and of the covenant of grace, as administered in the covenant of circumcision.

While I have objected to some things in your letters, do not suppose that I disapprove of them altogether. No sir, I believe you have given sufficient and unanswerable reasons, why the view

of baptists on the subject of baptism, should be refused, and I well believe that Mr. Campbell agrees with me in this, for had he believed that your arguments could have been answered, he would not have filled his strictures with *satyre*, but with *replies*, so far as you have espoused the cause of truth. I wish you success and peace in the Lord.

Yours, &c.

JOHN WALKER.

Jan. 14th, 1824

FINIS.

ERRATA.

We have only corrected such mistakes as particularly effect the sense; such as are evident, may be corrected by the reader.

—o—

Page 5, Line 3. omit *infant*. P. 25, L. 16, for *revolution*, read resolution. p. 28 L. 34 for *longevity* r. emigration. P. 51. L. 3, for 3. r. 5. P. 52, L. 13, for *may* r. cannot. P. 52, note, for *Inothi seauton* r. *Gnothi seauton*, know thyself. P. 56, L. 8 for *translation* r. transaction. P. 57. L. 34 for *appeared* r. appended. P. 64 L. 12. omit *not*. P. 89, L. 10 for 3rd, read 2nd. P. 115 L. 17. for COVENANT, r. INFERENCE. P. 117 L. 6, for *adopted* r. adapted. P. 118 L. 22, for *indeed* r. instead. P. 120 L. 9 for *interest* r. intent. L. 14. for *interest* r. intent. P. 131, L. 9, for *rational* r. national. P. 169 L. 8 for *institutions* r. instructions. P. 186 L. 23 for *letters* r. inference. P. 251 L. 23 for *ture* r. true. P. 253 L. 12 for *prepared* r. purchased. P. 264 L. 8 for *apparation* r. operation. L. 9 for *apparation* r. operation.